I.—THE RELATIVE POSITION OF ACTORS AND CHORUS IN THE GREEK THEATRE OF THE V CENTURY B. C.

Concluded.

III. THE PERIOD OF EURIPIDES AND ARISTOPHANES.

A. *Euripides.—Rhesus.*

The chorus, in its character of night-watch, approaches the tent of Hektor (1 ff.) in the background to awaken him. His reply (11 ff.) affords excellent evidence that the choreutae are close to him, not below in an orchestra. Odysseus and Diomedes enter (564) and find the tent of the Trojan chief empty. They depart to slay Rhesos. On their return (667) they are pursued by the chorus. 675 ff. βάλε | θένε θένε· τίς ὅδ' ἀνήρ; | λεύσσετε, τοῦτον αὐδῶ . . . | δεῦρο δεῦρο πᾶς | τούσδε ἔχω, 685 παῖε πᾶς, 688 τί δὴ τὸ σῶμα; Od. Φοῖβος, make clear as the light that in the lively pursuit all must have been in the orchestra together, and that the intruders are seized and held till the watchword is given. This scene simply requires more emphatically, what the entire play also demands, that there be no barrier between actors and chorus. All alike are soldiers, the only difference being that the actors are commanders. No good reason can be urged why the choreutae, in going to or coming from the camps of the Greeks and the Trojans, should make use of different roads, different exits, from those employed by Dolon, Odysseus, Diomedes, Rhesos, Aineias, Paris and Hektor under like circumstances.

Alcestis.

The proskenion represents the house of Admetos (1, 87, 477, 911, 941, etc.). As the chorus enter their attention is directed to the palace. They do not see before the doors water for bathing the dead; nor are there locks of shorn hair ἐπὶ προθύροις (98 ff.). Such minute observation as is implied in this last statement was only possible when the chorus stood near and on practically the same level with the palace door. The chorus is the first to see and announce that Alkestis is really dead (392). Such observation as this scene also requires would have been impossible on the 'stage' theory.

The funeral procession comes forth from the dwelling (605 ff.). Admetos addresses the choreutae, and bids them, while the servants are bearing the body, to salute the dead in the customary manner. No word is spoken to show that the chorus ascends or that the rest of the procession descends, yet there can hardly be a doubt that all leave by the same parodos (741). By the same road Herakles follows them (860); by the same entrance the funeral procession returns (861), and by the same way we certainly expect the son of Jove and Alkmene to bring back the rescued Alkestis (1007). Again, three entrances—the palace door and the two parodoi—meet all the requirements of the play.

Medea.

The chorus has so little to do with the action of the play that there are but few indications of the relative position of actors and choreutae. παρέλθω δόμους (1275) shows the possibility of the chorus entering the house, but again the exigencies of the play (as in Agamemnon) prevent such action. The first words of Jason (1293) addressing the choreutae are surely more natural if he enters through the parodos and joins them standing in front of the palace, than they would be if he came in on a 'stage' above them, and turned to address them, instead of giving his attention to the palace.

Before the doors can be broken in (1314) Medeia is visible on the chariot drawn by dragons (cf. Schol. in 1321), which has been given her by the Sun. Such a chariot, large enough to contain the sorceress and the bodies of her sons (1376 f.), requires room. On such a διστεγία as was possible if the 'stage' theory be accepted,[1]

---

[1] Cf. Part I, Müller, B.-A., S. 140 ff., and Haigh, Att. Th., p. 172.

such an equipage could not be placed. Actors on the narrow 'stage' would run decided risk of stepping overboard into the orchestra in their vain endeavor to get far enough from the building to be able to look up at objects on the roof of the dwelling. The scene becomes perfectly intelligible when we consider that the proskenion represented the palace of Jason, the 'stage' was its roof, on which was room not only for Medeia and her chariot, but also for the necessary stage machinery.

Hippolytus.

The statues of Artemis (58 ff., 72 f.) and Aphrodite (101, 116 f., 359, 522) are standing before the palace of Theseus (108, 171, 575, 790, 882 f., 1152) as Hippolytos appears (57), bidding his numerous band of attendants (54 f. πολὺς . . . κῶμος) sing to the goddess of the chase. This chorus of attendants (cf. Schol. in 58) enter, remain and depart (108 f.) with their master. For this scene the broad level of the orchestra is far better suited than is the narrow platform of the 'stage.'

Phaidra bids the real chorus of the play, not to ascend to a 'stage,' but (575) ταῖσδ' ἐπιστᾶσαι πύλαις. The choreutae do not obey because they are plainly terrified by the outcry of Phaidra (569 f.), and because the audience must also hear of what is taking place within the house. So they bid her announce to them what the evil may be (577 ff.). They do not respond to the appeals of the nurse (775, 780) that they (776) rush in and save her mistress. The action, from the first appeal of the nurse (775) to the announcement that Phaidra is dead (786), is too rapid to allow the choreutae to enter the dwelling even had they been so inclined. The foreordained has again come to pass, and the announcement has been made to the public in due form (cf. death-scene in Agamemnon).

Hecuba.

When Talthybios enters (483) the chorus have just completed an ode, and therefore are near the middle of the orchestra. He asks where he can find Hekabe. The reply, αὕτη πέλας σου . . . κεῖται ξυγκεκλημένη πέπλοις, proves that, as they point her out, they can see her lying, wrapped up in her mantle. Polyxene has just been borne away to the camp. In the agony of parting the mother threw herself down near the exit through which her daughter disappeared. Talthybios enters from the camp. Had

he come in on the 'stage' the prostrate form of the fallen queen must have been immediately before him. His question to the chorus would have been then quite uncalled for; he must have seen her before the chorus was visible to him. On the other hand, as he came through the parodos he must needs see the chorus first, and his question and their reply are both pertinent.

The choreutae are on the point of entering the hut of Agamemnon (43, 171, 619, 880, 1049) to bear aid to their friends within (1042), when Hekabe comes hastening forth (1044) to escape the furious Polymnestor (1070). There is no talk of descending steps, and no time for such action. Barely have they and the queen fled to one side (1054), when the raving Thracian bursts from the dwelling—upon a narrow stage? That would indeed be difficult to believe.

Cyclops.

The chorus with πρόσπολοι (83) enter (40), driving the flocks and herds of the Kyklops (43 f., 51 f.). Whether these are really animals or are men dressed as such, their erratic motions (41 ff.) show that they must enter the orchestra, from which they pass to the cave in the background (35, 82 f., 383).

Odysseus first sees the servants (96) as he enters, then perceives the satyrs, Silenos and the chorus by the cavern. Had he entered on a 'stage' he would have seen these last first. In the bargaining scene which follows there are present Odysseus, his several companions (85 f.), Silenos, the chorus, and the servants (191), who bring in the lambs bound ready to be borne away. The 'stage' could not well accommodate these numbers. The Kyklops' threat to beat the chorus (210 f.), and their reply (212 f.), prove that they are near him. A 'stage' would be very narrow accommodations for the giant when he comes forth drunk later on (502).

There is no hindrance for the choreutae if they desire to enter the cave, therefore they readily enter into conspiracy with Ulysses (451 ff.). To be sure, they refuse to aid in putting out the Kyklops' eye, not because they cannot easily ascend to a 'stage' (Müller, B.-A., S. 127)—that difficulty has been overcome many times in the course of the play—but because of the cowardly nature of the satyrs, and because the poet desires to amuse the spectators by their dancing rather than leave the stage empty.[1]

[1] Cf. Capps, The Stage in the Greek Theatre, p. 42.

The blinded giant (683 ff.) would have found the 'stage' a dangerous place. Odysseus announces that he is far from (689) the Kyklops, and undoubtedly he, his companions and the chorus have all moved out into the orchestra, on the appearance of their enemy, preparatory to departing together through the parodos on their way to the ship. The impossibility of representing the hillside and the cavern on the 'stage' has been discussed in connection with the Philoctetes.

Heraclidae.

Iolaos and a numerous company (10, 64, 91 f., 93, 248, 581) of the younger sons of Herakles sit as suppliants at the altar of Zeus (61, 79, 97 f., 121, 238, 341, etc.), at which the children remain throughout the play (344 ff.). This is the βωμός before the temple (41 f., 479, 643, 646, 657, 695 ff.), of sufficient size to receive this group. Excavations at Olympia and elsewhere have shown that such altars were not placed close before the temples; their use for sacrifices forbade that. The size and probable character of this altar alike tend to prove that it could not have been on a narrow platform of a 'stage.'

When Kopreus is attempting to drag the children away he throws Iolaos violently to the ground (75 f., 128 f.). In response to the cry for help (69 f.) the chorus come in with a rush (73), on the same level with the actors, for their presence compels Kopreus to desist from his attempt. Because they are later with Demophaon, the messenger of the Argive king feels that he is powerless (274 μιᾶς γὰρ χειρὸς ἀσθενὴς μάχη). Iolaos bids the chorus and the children exchange the pledge of the right hand (307, 308). The choreutae fulfil this duty in their character of representatives of the Athenian people (cf. 69), and the king is separately addressed (320 ff.). This act of pledging is performed by all the chorus (307 f.). Thus scenery and text alike require that the play be acted in the orchestra.

Hercules Furens.

The chorus enter (106), to find the father, wife and children of Herakles as suppliants at an altar (51, 72, 243) before the palace of the hero (107, 330, 523, 622, 1142). The passage 119 ff. is very corrupt, and it is doubtful whether ἄναντες belongs in the text. At best, however, the words referring to ascent are used in the comparison, and refer to the 'yoke-bearing steed' as showing the

cause of its weariness. The chorus of old men, each of whom
leans on his staff for support (107 ff.), comes feebly in, each man
assisting his neighbor (125). They are on the same level and
near to the actors, for they are on the point of striking Lykos
(254), and declare (262 f.) that while they are alive he cannot
carry out his design of slaying the children. The long choral
ode (348–441) must have been delivered in the orchestra. There
is no indication that they descend for this, nor that they ascend
for the following scene. Here Amphitryon is bidding farewell to
the chorus (503 ff.), when Herakles enters and finds all together
before his house (525 ff.). He beholds his family in funeral garb
standing not *near* but *among* the choreutae (ὄχλῳ τ' ἐν ἀνδρῶν).
The words of the hero (529), that he will approach them, are
nonsense if he refers to the few feet between the side and the
middle of a 'stage'; they are natural if he is near the parodos,
while the others are grouped together in the orchestra, immedi-
ately in front of the palace.

At 748 the chorus cry σκοπῶμεν 'let us look into the palace.'
The death-cry of Lykos is heard a few moments later, and the
choreutae begin their dance in the orchestra. The description of
objects within the palace (1029 ff.) shows that they are again
where they can see within the ruined dwelling. They flee to
avoid the danger, when it is announced that Herakles is coming
forth (1081 f.). This danger could exist only because he is
coming out into the orchestra. In company with Amphitryon
(1109 ff.) they again approach the dwelling. These passages
offer strong proof that no stage existed as a barrier between the
chorus and the palace, particularly when we remember that the
choreutae could not have seen the hero lying chained among the
ruins of his dwelling, had the so-called stage been in their way.

Andromache.

The proskenion again represents a palace (41, 495, 817, 1055).
The shrine of Thetis, by which Andromache is sitting at the
opening of the play, is referred to under different names: 115
ἄγαλμα θεᾶς, 117 δάπεδον καὶ ἀνάκτορα, 135 ἀγλαὸν ἕδραν, 161 δῶμα Νηρῆ-
δος τόδε, | οὐ βωμὸς οὐδὲ ναός, 253 ἁγνὸν τέμενος ἐναλίας θεοῦ, 380 τῶνδ'
ἀνακτόρων, 411 βωμόν. This is no ordinary altar, but a precinct,
τέμενος, containing a house, δῶμα, ναός, an altar, βωμός, and an image,
ἄγαλμα. There is no room for such a structure in the background
—the palace is there—nor on the so-called stage—that is too

narrow to afford space for the shrine and for the actors. This structure is then in the orchestra, and in the orchestra is represented the main action of the play which concerns Andromache sitting within this temenos.

The choreutae are on one occasion (817) about to rush in to prevent the suicide of Hermione, but before they can do this she is heard coming forth (822). So they remain without. The text implies the easy possibility of their entering (cf. Müller, B.-A., S. 127).

Suppliants.

As the play opens, Aithra, with the mothers of 'the seven' (20), is sitting at the altars (33, 64, 93) before the temple of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis (30, 88, 938). Adrastos, surrounded by the sons of 'the seven,' lies at the doors of the same temple (22, 104). 279 ἀμφιπίτνουσα τὸν σὸν γόνυ and 284 f. περὶ σοῖσι γούνασιν prove that Theseus is standing close by the Argive king. But Theseus' direction to the chorus (359 f.) to remove the hallowed garlands from his mother, that he may lead her back to the city, show that Aithra and the suppliants are also on the same level with the actors. In the Heracleidae it has been pointed out that the βωμός of a temple would not be placed on a 'stage.' The chorus of 15, Aithra, Adrastos, with the seven sons (106, 1124 f., 1224), make a total of 24 persons, arranged in two groups, when Theseus and his attendants enter. It is incredible, again, that so many persons could occupy this 'stage.' No room would remain for the necessary action. When nearly one-third of the play is past, and the chorus is bidden (359) to leave the altar, the word of Theseus is not a command to descend to a level below that occupied by the actors. As a matter of fact, the choreutae are with the actors later on.

Adrastos goes to meet the bodies (772), and commands that they be brought in (811). 815 ff. δόθ', ὡς περιπτυχαῖσι δὴ | χέρας προσαρμόσασ' ἐμοῖς | ἐν ἀγκῶσι τέκνα θῶμαι cries the chorus. ἔχεις, ἔχεις is the reply. The choreutae are in the orchestra, for they have just completed the ode 778 ff. But they here embrace the bodies brought in under the direction of Adrastos. Theseus also comes (837), and stands by the bodies while the heroes are being described (860 ff.). As the dead are borne forth, Adrastos invites the chorus to follow (941). This Theseus forbids (942), but Adrastos promises that they shall receive the bones (948 f.). The chorus remain, that they may be present at the burning of

the body of Kapaneus (cf. Müller, B.-A., S. 127).   To them in
the orchestra are brought the ashes of their dead by the Epigoni
(1113 ff.), and from the orchestra they march forth in company
with Adrastos (1132), at the end.

There is no room on a 'stage' for the pyre of Kapaneus (981,
1010, 1058) and the towering rock (987) from which Evadne leaps
(1071), to say nothing of the danger to wooden 'stage' and stage-
buildings from the actually burning pile (1012–1017). Dismissing
the stage-idea as untenable, the lofty rock occupies a portion of
the space where stood the later proskenion, and the burning pile
was on the earth in the orchestra.   The importance of the chorus
and the freedom with which it mingles with the actors remind one
strongly of the early plays of Aischylos.

Troades.

Hekabe, lying before the door (37) of the hut (32, 139, 155, 157,
294, 359, 880) in which are confined the captive Trojan women,
calls (143 f.) on the chorus within (cf. Schol. in 139) to sing
responsively with her.   One semichorus comes forth at 153 (cf.
157), the other at 176 (cf. Schol. in loc.).   The ode 197–229 is of
course sung in the orchestra, but, again, no word shows that the
performers descend to reach their accustomed place.

Andromache appears with her son (571, 614, 702, 713, 749, 782,
786), riding on a chariot (569, 572, 626).   From 610 ἀγόμεθα λεία
σὺν τέκνῳ and 622 τῶν δ' ὄχων we learn that she remains in the
chariot at least till 626.   Her chariot can only enter to the
orchestra.   There is no mention of her leaving this vehicle, much
less of her ascending to or descending from a stage.   She unques-
tionably rides forth (779) on the same conveyance on which she
entered.   All things tend to show that this scene, in which Andro-
mache holds long and intimate conversation with Hekabe, and
pours forth all her mother's tenderness in embracing her son
(755 ff.), has taken place in the orchestra.   Thither come Talthy-
bios and his companions to seize and destroy the child.   There
Hekabe utters her lament for her grandson (790 ff.).   From thence
the herald commands the chorus (1266 ff.) to depart to the shore
at the sound of the trump, and bids Hekabe follow him (1269 f.).
She does not obey, and he directs the servants to lead her forth
(1285).   Still she does not go, but from 1302 to the end she sings
the responsive dirge with the chorus.   She kneels (1305 f.) and
places her hands on the ground; the choreutae follow her example

(1307 f.). Here also all are moving toward the same shore, from the same level, through the same parodos, and the poet sends all forth in procession at the close of the play.

Iphigenia Taurica.

73. ἐξ αἱμάτων γοῦν ξάνθ' ἔχει θριγκώματα

Ορ. θριγκοῖς δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῖς σκῦλ' ὁρᾷς ἠρτημένα ;

Πυ. τῶν κατθανόντων γ' ἀκροθίνια ξένων

. . . . . .

113 Πυ. ὅρα δὲ γεῖσα τριγλύφων ὅποι κενὸν

δέμας καθεῖναι·

No such minute and realistic description of scenery is found in any of the preceding plays. These lines demonstrate that the temple was carefully represented. The long back wall of a 'stage' was hardly adapted for such a building. The theatre carpenter could, however, in the period of which we are speaking, build the proskenion in whatever form the drama required. Its door would then open out upon the orchestra.

Iphigeneia, coming from the temple (142), joins the chorus, addresses the choreutae as δμωαί (143), offers her shorn locks, and pours a libation to the shade of her brother (159 ff.), in which the chorus assist by singing a hymn to the dead (179 ff.). As in the other libation scenes in which the chorus take part (e. g. Persians 619 ff., Choeph. 92 ff.), actors and chorus are together in the orchestra. In 1069 ff. Iphigeneia appeals to the various members of the chorus not to betray her. There is in her words no actual demonstration that actors and chorus are together in the orchestra, but it is improbable that Iphigeneia is talking in this individual, intimate manner to a group of people twelve feet below and at some distance from her.

Ion.

Seven metopes are carefully described (184–218), and therefore the temple-front (79, 219 ff., 510, 1319 f.) must have been represented in a most realistic manner. Hermes says (76): εἰς δαφνώδη γύαλα βήσομαι, from which it is fair to infer that painted decorations represented the laurel groves of Delphi. To one who has climbed the steep hillside to the site of the ancient temple of the oracle, the words of Kreousa and the pedagogue as they enter (cf. 724–738 f.) convey an additional idea of the realistic nature of the scene presented to the gaze of the Athenian audience. The

temple (738 ff.), μαντεῖα, did lie high, αἰπεινά. A winding path
(743 περιφερῆ στίβον) may well have led up to it. The old man's
exhaustion (739 ff.) under such circumstances was to be expected.
Here, as in the Philoktetes and the Birds, any indication of the
ascending path was possible only in the orchestra. The conver-
sation of the two actors (724–747) shows that they are slowly but
steadily advancing. At 747 Kreousa first sees and addresses the
chorus. The time consumed in uttering these 23 verses would be
requisite for entering through the parodos and passing to a
position near the front of the temple, but not for moving from the
side to the centre of a 'stage.'

In the distance traversed this scene resembles 183 ff. The
choreutae, loitering and discussing the metopes in the latter scene,
consume a still longer time before they are near enough to
address Ion (219). They do not enter the temple because they
have not performed the necessary sacrifices, and have no motive
but idle curiosity (226 ff.); not because there is a stage in the way
(cf. Müller, B.-A., S. 127).

The choreutae are the servants of Kreousa. Arriving with her
from Athens, they have come direct to the temple (183, 252 ff.).
Mistress and servants enter then by the same path. The cho-
reutae are still at a little distance from the temple when they first
call to Ion (219 σέ τοι τὸν παρὰ ναόν). Kreousa has perchance
stopped by one of the altars to offer the necessary sacrifices,[1] for
we find no word in the following lines that it is unlawful for her
to enter the temple because of failure to do this. The chorus
says (237): παρούσας δ᾽ ἀμφὶ τάσδ᾽ ἐρωτᾷς. She is still at a little
distance, for it is not till 241 that Ion observes that she is weeping.
On a stage she would have been within a few feet of him as soon
as she was visible at all. The entire scene gains in clearness
when we recognize that actor and chorus enter through the parodos.

Kreousa comes hastening in (1249) to her attendants, asking
what she shall do to escape the death to which she has just been
sentenced. Naturally she comes to them, not to a platform above
them. In obedience to their advice (1255 ff.), she goes as a
suppliant to the altar (1275, 1280, 1401, 1403). Like the temple
βωμός in the plays previously discussed, this was in the orchestra.
So from the orchestra at the end, in obedience to the commands
of Athena, master, mistress and newly-found son, with the serv-
ants, the choreutae, move forth together on their way to Athens.

Cf. Capps, The Stage in the Greek Theatre, p. 23.

Electra.

Orestes and his companions (394) enter, and perceive Elektra returning from the stream with water (107). They sit down (109 ἐζώμεσθα) very near to the peasant's hut (216), which the proskenion for this play represents (78, 251, 489, 750, 1233). Elektra sings the long ode 112–166, the chorus joins her (166), and together they sing the verses 167–212. The choreutae are present as the friends (175) of Elektra, and invite her to come with them to receive the proper apparel and join in the festive dance (191 ff.). This scene implies that actors and chorus are together. But the strangers, though they have no reason for concealment (109 ff.), remain unobserved from 112 to 215. Had Elektra entered on the side of a 'stage,' Orestes and his companions would have been directly before her eyes, but a few feet distant. She could not have avoided seeing them during the recital of one hundred verses. She begins her song, however, as she comes in through the parodos, is joined by the chorus, and all move gradually toward the cottage, absorbed in their conversation. As a movement of Orestes (217) suddenly attracts the attention of his sister, frightened, she calls to the chorus to hasten back the way they came (218), while she attempts to escape into the house.

At 962 Elektra sees her mother coming from Argos in her chariot. To look from the 'stage' out through the parodos, through which the chariot must enter, is an impossibility. The queen enters at 987. Elektra comes forward to meet her, and offers to assist her from the chariot (1006). Beyond a doubt then are the two actors here in the orchestra. Not till 1135 does Klytaimnestra send the chariot forth. Like the old man in Ion, the old servant complains of the steepness of the way (489). Here, as in Ion, the ascending path leads from the parodos.

Helena.

The central point of the action during the first 1200 lines is the tomb of Proteus in front of the royal palace (64, 324, 528, 797, 984, 1165, 1203). On this (984 ff. τύμβον 'πὶ νώτοις) Menelaus declares that he will slay Helen and himself, so that their blood shall flow down the tomb, and their two bodies shall lie upon it. Although, as he enters (1164), his first words are a salute to the sepulchre of his father, Theoklymenos does not see Menelaos

crouching by this tomb till Helen points out her husband (1203). Then this structure was of considerable size.

When Helen reappears from the palace at 527 she speaks of again coming to the sepulchre, but does not see Menelaos till 544. She has not then reached her former resting-place, for she cries out that she is being kept from the tomb by the stranger (550 f.). This monument would hardly be built against the very front of the palace. This fact, its size, its distance from the palace door, all tend to demonstrate that it was constructed in the orchestra. Then the action was in the orchestra. This agrees with that free intercourse between actors and chorus in 327 ff. and 1624 ff., also with the presence of the band of hunters with their dogs and nets (1169 f.).

It is necessary that the scene be vacant when Menelaos appears (386 ff.). Therefore the chorus accompanies Helen within the palace, reappearing with her at 514. There is no sign of difficulty connected with this action.

Theoklymenos threatens to revenge himself on his sister (1624 ff.). The chorus remonstrate (1627), but he bids them to get out of the way (1628). They respond that they will not release their grasp on his garments (1629). There is no reason why the choreutae should be on a 'stage' just previous to 1624. Between 1624 and 1628 there is no time for the entire chorus, nor for any members of it, to leave their position in the orchestra and ascend a flight of steps to seize the actor. The teaching of the entire text is, then, that no stage existed.

Phoenissae.

The palace in Thebes (99, 193, 277, 1067, 1342, 1636), with the customary altars before it (274, 604, 631), is in the background. The pedagogue, in company with Antigone, appears (87), investigates the road in front of the palace (92), then invites his companion to ascend the steps (100), to reach the point from whence she can see the hosti'e army. She requires his assistance to mount the difficult ascent (103 f.). The Scholiast to 90 understands διῆρες ἔσχατον to refer to a second story. Pollux, IV 129, informs us that the two ascend to the διστεγία. From the text this much is clear, the two actors come forth and ascend to some portion of the decoration. For such an elevation, and the stairs leading to it, there is not room on the narrow stage.

In response to Polyneikes' declaration of his birth and name (288 ff.), the chorus prostrate themselves at his knees (294 f.), a difficult action, to say the least, if he is not with them in the orchestra.

Antigone enters (1484) with the procession which bears the dead bodies of her mother and her two brothers (1491, 1523, 1526 f., 1563, 1627, 1629, 1635, 1665). Kreon is present with the attendants, whom he commands (1660) to seize Antigone. It is natural to suppose that other soldiers besides the bearers enter with the funeral train (1484). The blind Oidipous joins the company at 1539. Antigone embraces the body of her mother (1661), and leads her father that he may touch the bodies in turn (1693, 1699). There is room, then, for unimpeded action. Yet, without mentioning the number of soldiers who escort the funeral train, or the number of attendants with Kreon, there were present the three dead, stretched on their biers, four bearers for each, Oidipous, Antigone, and Kreon—19 necessary persons. It is highly improbable that such numbers, with the altars and other necessary decorations, were crowded together on a 'stage,' when abundant room existed in the orchestra.

Orestes.

As the play opens Elektra is sitting by Orestes, who is sleeping on a couch (35, 44, 88, 185, 311), before the palace of Agamemnon (60, 112, 356, 744, 1119, 1358). She cautions the chorus to move gently (136), to retire from before the couch (142). Again, when they show that they can move lightly and speak softly (147 f.), she bids them approach. They are close by the sleeper (166), for they cry out ὁρᾷς; ἐν πέπλοισι κινεῖ δέμας. Their cries disturb the sleeper, and Electra again bids them move away (171). This request, repeated in 187 f., is then obeyed, for the choreutae at 208 f. cannot see whether Orestes is sleeping. The words of the play show clearly enough that the chorus is throughout the scene moving near the actors, but the verbs of motion employed all imply motion to and fro on the same level. Nothing here suggests a stage (cf. Müller, B.-A., S. 125).

In 1246 ff. Electra and the chorus remain outside to guard against surprise. Electra commands (1251) στῆθ' αἱ μὲν ὑμῶν τόνδ' ἀμαξήρη τρίβον, | αἱ δ' ἐνθαδ' ἄλλον οἶμον εἰς φρουρὰν δόμων. The one semichorus replies (1258) that they will guard the east, the other says (1260) that they will watch the west. Since they are guard-

ing against actors, they will be on a 'stage,' if there be a stage. Only two paths are mentioned, and the choreutae are guarding these on either side of the proskenion. But the ἀμαξήρη τρίβον can be nothing else than the road by which chariots are accustomed to enter the orchestra. One entrance on either side, and that leading into the orchestra, is exactly what the new theory demands.

The closing scene (1554 ff.) adds its emphatic testimony in favor of the same theory. As Menelaos and his attendants (1562) are about to break in the gates, there appear on the roof of the palace Orestes (1567), Hermione (1575), Pylades (1620), and others (1574). The knife is placed at Hermione's throat and the torches are ready to set fire to the building. The roof of the palace, i. e. the top of the proskenion, alone could afford the necessary room for this exciting scene. Only in the orchestra, in fact, could Menelaos and his companions remove far enough from the front wall of the palace to see the roof easily.

Bacchae.

The text does not make clear the exact location of the tomb of Semele (6, 596 ff.), which must be, however, near the palace (7, 170, 212, 606, 1165, 1368).

In 55 ff. Bacchos addresses the chorus as present, and announces that he has brought them with him from among the barbarians, as his companions. There is no direct statement to this effect, but, as the immediate followers of the god, we expect them to enter on the same level and at the same time with him. Their entrance at another time and place is not suggested.

The cry of the god to light the lamp and burn the house of Pentheus (576) comes from within, for the chorus question from whence it is (579); and Bacchos explains (616 ff.) that, as the flame sprung upon the grave of his mother, the king believed his palace was burning, and labored with his servants to quench the flames. These actions of the king take place within; without the choreutae only see the pillars of the house shake at the presence of the god (591). Consequently there can be no difficulty in ascending a 'stage,' of which Müller (B.-A., S. 127) speaks.

The numbers present at the end—Agave (1167), women of Thebes (1203 ff.), Kadmos and his servants bearing the remains of Pentheus (1216), Bacchos (1330 f.), the guides for Agave (1381) —are too numerous to be readily accommodated on the 'stage.'

Iphigenia Aulidensis.

The old servant of Agamemnon sets out on the road to Argos (163), but is brought back by Menelaos (302). The messenger enters by the same road (414), to announce the coming of Klytaimnestra. The chorus proclaim that she is visible (592), and the testimony that she rides into the orchestra is exceedingly clear. Rejecting the doubtful verses 598–606, in 607 Klytaimnestra thanks the chorus for their kindly greeting. She bids (610 ff.) some take from the chariot and bear within the hut (1, 12, 440, 678, 820, 1098, 1106) the wedding gifts for her child, and asks the choreutae to assist Iphigenia to alight (617). She directs others to stand in front of the horses, that they may not become frightened (619), and still others to take the boy Orestes (621). Iphigeneia runs to meet her father (631 ff.). Who will care to maintain either that she ascends to or that he descends from a 'stage' that they may come together? They enter the tent on the invitation of the king (678). The text teaches that the orchestra is simply the open space in front of the royal quarters, with no impediment to free passage from the one to the other.

Again, Iphigeneia cries that she sees a crowd (1338 ὄχλον) approaching. The mother replies that this is Achilles, and that hero himself (1359) informs us that these followers are on the scene. But the attendants of Agamemnon are also present in numbers (1463 ὀπαδῶν τῶνδε). It is almost needless to remark that the Greek 'stage' afforded no room for action in the presence of numbers.

It is interesting, indeed, to find the testimony of this last drama of Euripides so emphatically supporting the theory that actors and chorus occupied the same level in the classic period of the Greek drama.

B. *Aristophanes.*[1]—*Acharnenses.*

The opening scene portrays an assembly on the Pnyx. Dikaiopolis is seated as the Prytanes come crowding in (42), each endeavoring to obtain the best seat. The herald calls to order (43), and asks who desires to speak. Amphitheos responds (46 ff.). His words not being pleasing, he is removed by the

---

[1] The writer acknowledges his special indebtedness to "The 'Stage' in Aristophanes," by Prof. John Williams White, in Harvard Studies in Class. Philol., vol. II, p. 159 ff.

policemen (54 f.), and the embassadors to the great king are announced (61). With them comes Pseudartabas (91) and two eunuchs (117). This worthy company retire to dine in the Prytaneion (123 ff.), but their places are more than filled by the arrival of the envoy to the king of Thrace, with his army of Odomantians (156 στρατός). There must have been some attempt to represent the Pnyx with its Bema and its benches for the Prytanes and spectators. The Prytanes are present in numbers (26, 43), and people occupy the remaining benches (56 τὴν ἐκκλη-σίαν) with Dikaiopolis and Amphitheos. When to all these are added the embassadors and their companions, or the envoy and his Thraceans, thirty is surely an understatement of the number present (cf. White, p. 189). These actors and mutes, in the lively scenes when Amphitheos is removed by force (54), and when the Odomantians rob Dikaiopolis of his garlic (163 ff.), could not have been placed on any 'stage.' Therefore some portion of the orchestra represented the Pnyx, and there is no reason why, from the beginning, the proskenion may not have represented the houses of Dikaiopolis (262, 1095 ff.), of Lamachos (1072, 1095 ff.) and of Euripides (395 ff.).

Since the Acharnians are in pursuit of Amphitheos, and he appears on the Pnyx (175), they also appear here. Yet they are before the house of Dikaiopolis and hear him preparing to come forth (238). Our hero, his wife and daughter (245), two slaves (259 f.), and probably the rest of the household whom we find mentioned in 817 ff., 1003 ff., appear. From 262 (πρόβα) to 280 the procession is in motion. This march is impossible on a 'stage,' and a διστεγία above a 'stage' would have been narrow quarters for the wife and daughter.

Since if he does not persuade the chorus he is willing to forfeit his life, Dikaiopolis (365) brings the ἐπίξηνον to the orchestra, where the chorus is. Therefore, when the one semichorus seeks to strike him (564 θενεῖς), but is prevented from doing so by the other, there is no hint that the choreutae must climb steps in order to reach the object of their enmity.

It is hardly conceivable that the Boiotian with his flute-players (863), and his attendants loaded with fish, flesh and fowl (874 ff., 878 ff.), could have entered on any stage. But with reference to the Megarian a word is used which is held to prove that he and his daughters enter the orchestra and ascend to a stage. ἄμβατε ποττὰν μάδδαν αἴ χ' εὑρῆτέ πα (731), he calls to his children. But there

is no reason why the Megarian should enter the orchestra, if this was not the customary place for the actors. In discussing *Knights* 149 we shall find that ἄμβατε signifies simply 'enter.'

In his drunken elation at his victory in the drinking bout, Dikaiopolis cries out (1225) ποῦ 'στιν ὁ βασιλεύς; ἀπόδοτέ μοι τὸν ἀσκόν. Previous to that moment, then, he has not received his prize. At 1230 the chorus calls χώρει λαβὼν τὸν ἀσκόν. Between 1224 and 1230 the wine-skin has been given to him, probably with some joke on the Archon Basileus (White). This could, of course, only take place in the orchestra, from which alone approach to the seat of the Archon was possible. At 1231 Dikaiopolis invites the chorus to follow him singing. This they do 1232 ff., and, as a matter of course, this procession moves from the orchestra through the parodos.

Equites.

The scene is before the dwelling of Demos (110 ff., 234 ff., 725 ff.), that is, the Acropolis, and the proskenion represents the propylaia (1326), not, of course, that of Mnesikles, but the lower gateway to the citadel. Probably here, as in the Lysistrata, where the propylaia is also represented, the ascending road leading to the Acropolis entrance was indicated.

Demosthenes calls to the sausage-seller (147 ff.) ὦ μακάριε | ἀλλαντοπῶλα, δεῦρο δεῦρ' ὦ φίλτατε, | ἀνάβαινε σωτὴρ τῇ πόλει καὶ νῷν φανείς. In Dübner three scholia are given to 149 : 1. ἀνάβαινε σωτὴρ τῇ πόλει· Ἵνα, φησὶν, ἐκ τῆς παρόδου ἐπὶ τὸ λογεῖον ἀναβῇ. 2. διὰ τί οὖν ἐκ τῆς παρόδου; τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον. λεκτέον οὖν ὅτι ἀναβαίνειν ἐλέγετο τὸ ἐπὶ τὸ λογεῖον εἰσιέναι. ὃ καὶ πρόσκειται. λέγεται γὰρ καταβαίνειν τὸ ἀπαλ- λάττεσθαι ἐντεῦθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἔθους. 3. ὡς ἐν θυμέλῃ δὲ τὸ ἀνάβαινει. Suidas s. v. ἀνάβαινε repeats substantially the words of the second scholiast. Three other passages in Aristophanes must be con- sidered with the above: Ach. 731-2, already noted (ἄμβατε); Wasps 1341, where Philokleon calls on the flute-player to enter (ἀνάβαινε); and Eccl. 1151 ff., in which the choreutae say that while the actors are passing off (καταβαίνεις) they will sing in accompaniment (ἐπᾴσομαι; cf. Eurip. Elect. 864 and Hdt. I 132, White).

It is to be carefully noted—

1. That in the passages cited from the Achar. and Knights no reason is apparent why the actors should be entering by other than the usual way. In the Eccl. the chorus keep their word and sing the accompaniment as the procession passes from the theatre.

2. The words ἀναβαίνειν, καταβαίνειν are used in this way but these four times in all the extant Greek dramas; and each time they refer to an actor or mute who is on the point of entering or departing by a side entrance. In the many instances in which the chorus join the actors or leave them to return to their customary position, these words are never used.

3. The scholiasts do not agree. This illustrates, what needed no additional illustration, that, while there is a very large amount of valuable information in the scholia, while many of their opinions go back to excellent authority, there are scattered through the scholia notes made by men who were not in a position to know the truth, who often betray most lamentable ignorance of the real force and meaning of the passages on which they commented. In short, the unsupported testimony of a scholiast cannot be cited as authority against the plain teaching of the dramas themselves.

The words of the second scholiast have the greatest interest for us. Not only do his explanations of ἀναβαίνειν by εἰσιέναι and καταβαίνειν by ἀπαλλάττεσθαι exactly agree with what the situations in the various plays demand, but his statement that these meanings were derived ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἔθους is most important. The ancient time referred to is that mentioned by Pollux, IV 123 : ἐλεὸς δ' ἦν τράπεζα ἀρχαία, ἐφ' ἦν πρὸ Θέσπιδος εἶς τις ἀναβὰς κτλ. In those days before Thespis ἀναβάς meant to ascend to the table. In the later, the time of the scholiast, for example, ἀνα-κατα-βαίνειν had come to have merely the technical meaning of entering and retiring.

The third scholiast refers the words of the text to ascending to the θυμέλη, but to a θυμέλη to which *actors* were wont to ascend. His idea of the θυμέλη agrees with what has already been said of this portion of the βωμός (cf. Part I).

The entrances and exits of the actors in all four of the passages cited were made, then, as usual. The first two scholiasts, however, mention the λογεῖον as a well-known portion of the theatre. This proves neither more nor less than at the time in which they lived the stage was customary in the theatre, and, so far as they knew, .the same platform was in use in classic times. We know nothing of the age in which they lived, nor of the authorities they may have used. Therefore we cannot accept their testimony where it conflicts with the evidence of all the extant Greek dramas—including the very one on which they have commented—that a stage never existed in the classic Greek theatre of the time of the great dramatists.[1]

[1] Cf. White, " The 'Stage' in Aristophanes," p. 164 ff., for the entire discussion of these scholia.

To return to the play. The chorus enters in haste (246). παῖε (247), δίωκε καὶ τάραττε (251), they cry. They themselves take an active part in the beating and pursuing (252, 255 ff., 271, 272, 273). There would be no room for this lively scene on a 'stage,' nor is there any indication that the chorus mount to such a platform. In 451 ff. the choreutae again fall upon Kreon and pummel him. The action is again quickly agreed upon and as quickly executed. The actor and chorus are plainly near each other, where the latter can fall upon their enemy and pummel him whenever the desire seizes them. It is because they are on the same level with the actor that the choreutae (490 ff.) easily equip the sausage-seller for the coming fray with the flask of oil and the garlic. At 919 ff. again no barrier exists between them and their champion, as they hand him the ladle with which to 'skim off' the frothy Kleon.

Nubes.

The proskenion represents two separate buildings. The one before which father and son are sleeping at the opening of the play, from which Strepsiades bids the servant bring forth a light and his writing-tablets (18 f.), into which Pheidippides enters (125), stands till the end of the play. For the father leads his son within to entertain him (1212), the old man's creditors call him forth (1221, 1258, 1320), and he rushes out (1320), calling for help because he is being beaten by his son. He summons Xanthias to come forth (1485 f.), bringing with him the implements necessary for the destruction of the Phrontisterion. Before this dwelling of Strepsiades is the statue of equestrian Poseidon (83).

But the building of chief importance in the play is the 'thinking-shop' of Socrates. First mentioned in 92, allusions to it are frequent (132, 183, 195, 506, 804, 1144, etc.). In the final scene Strepsiades and his servant mount to the top of this building (1487, 1502), and dig down through the roof (1488, 1496). Finally they set fire to the house (1490, 1494, 1497, 1504). There is a real climbing from the orchestra to the top of the proskenion, hence the κλίμακες mentioned by Pollux are used.

The two houses are quite separate and distinct. There is no room for them on a narrow 'stage.' A distegia two feet wide could not represent the roof in this case; it would not afford space sufficient for the action. It is incredible that fire should be applied to scenery the continuation of which represents the entire

background, including the house of Strepsiades himself. These difficulties all disappear when it is granted that these buildings stood as separate houses on that space later occupied by the stone proskenia, such as those of Oropos and Eretria.

Vespae.

The house of Philokleon is realistically represented (142 ff., 172 ff., 196 ff., 317 ff., 456, 1484 ff.). Bdelykleon, who is sleeping on the roof as the play begins, drives his father back as he attempts to escape through the chimney (142 ff.). But the old man again appears on the roof (202 ff.), and later on (379 f.) tries to lower himself from a window with a cord. This roof could not have been represented by such a διστεγία as Müller and Haigh have imagined.

The scene (170 ff.) in which the ass is led forth with Philokleon clinging beneath his belly, like Odysseus beneath the ram in the Odyssey, just as all scenes in which animals were introduced, could only take place in the orchestra.

The road by which the chorus of dikasts appears (228) is a street of the city (247 ff.). They halt before the house of Philokleon to wait for his appearance. The houses of Athens were certainly not perched on platforms twelve feet above the street. On the supposition of a 'stage,' in the duet following the appearance of the chorus, Philokleon would have been some 20 to 25 feet above his fellow-dikasts (White). When his attempted escape is prevented (394), he calls upon the chorus (402) to keep the promise they made (383) to defend him. The choreutae prepare to obey (420, 423), and rush upon the actors (453 ff.), are beaten back by Xanthus, suffocated with smoke (457), again clubbed (458). Though much is said of rushing forward and driving back, there is not one word of ascending or descending. Not till 727 do the choreutae finally throw aside their stones. From the moment that the choreutae first appear before the dwelling till their weapons are finally laid down, the text clearly assumes that the door of the house opens on the level of the orchestra.

ἀνάβαινε (1342) needs but a word of additional explanation[1] here. Philokleon and the girl enter together, for he has just stolen her and brought her away from his boon companions. They come in (1325) to the same level just occupied by Xanthias, or he would not be so fearful of receiving another drubbing (1324).

---

[1] Cf. discussion of Knights, 147 ff.

The pursuing ·Bdelykleon and the συμπόται must appear in the same portion of the theatre (1331). The old man drives his pursuers back, leads the flute-player farther in, where Bdelykleon again finds them (1363). From 1325 to 1363, then, the actors occupy their usual portion of the theatre, and the drunken old man neither climbs to a 'stage' himself, nor drags his flute-girl up to one.

It is now so commonly admitted (cf. White, 168) that καταβατέον γ' ἐπ' αὐτούς (1514) means *in certamen descendere* that it is hardly necessary to say that no change of level is implied here. The chorus make room for Philokleon and the sons of Karkinos (1516), and sing the accompaniment for the dance which follows. Finally all the occupants of the scene go dancing off through the parodos together (1535 ff.). To complete the proof that the entire play has been presented in the orchestra, we need simply note that the sons of Karkinos, though mutes, plainly appear in the orchestra, and that the violent motions of Philokleon (1484 ff.) could not be safely made by a drunken man on a narrow 'stage.'

Pax.

The change from earth to heaven and from heaven back to earth has given commentators more trouble, perhaps, than has any other passage of our poet. It is natural, however, that the scene before the palace of Zeus should take place on the theologeion, where the gods were accustomed to appear.

The figure of Peace was of great size (schol. Plato, Apol. 19, C.). Hermes says she has been cast into a deep cave (223), below where he and Trygaios are standing (224). The latter has actually ascended through the air (149 ff., 174 f.). The platform on which he has landed is large enough to contain himself, Hermes, the great statue, Theoria, and Opora. The scholiast to 727 informs us that Trygaios and the two maidens descend to the orchestra by means of klimakes. These suggestions all point to the roof of the proskenion as the location of heaven. But we cannot accept the additional statement of the scholiast just quoted, that probably (ἴσως) the chorus has also been in heaven with the actors. It is composed of γεωργῶν 'Αθμονέων (Dramatis Personae, Codex V) and comes in (300) calling to Trygaios to direct them. The dance which follows (322 ff.) would be possible only in the orchestra. Accompanying them is a crowd of Boiotians (466), Argives (475, 494), Spartans (478), Megarians (481, 500), and

Lamachos (473). This numerous company is possible only in
the orchestra. The absurdity of the chorus and their companions
tugging away in the orchestra, on earth, while Hermes and Try-
gaios are directing them from the heavens, is not so great as the
absurdity of allowing the chorus to climb by some means to that
heaven to which Trygaios only attained by the flight of his beetle
(cf. Capps, p. 76 f.). In the Peace, then, we have the only instance
in the classic drama of the use of the so-called stage by the actors
for any considerable time. At the bidding of Hermes (427)
some of the choreutae enter (εἰσιόντες) the proskenion, in order
to 'remove the stones' and so prepare for the raising of the
goddess.

Trygaios appeals (881 f.) to the audience to inform him who is
to care for Theoria, then adds that he will himself lead to a posi-
tion in their midst. He invites the Prytanis to receive her (905),
then cries (906) θέασ' ὡς προθύμως ὁ πρύτανις παρεδέξατο. There can
be no doubt that Theoria actually goes to the spectators' seats.

> 962.   Tryg. καὶ τοῖς θεαταῖς ῥῖπτε τῶν κριθῶν.   Oik. ἰδού.
>   Tryg. ἔδωκας ἤδη; Oik. νὴ τὸν Ἑρμῆν ὥστε γε
>   τούτων ὁσοιπέρ εἰσι τῶν θεωμένων
>   οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐ κριθὴν ἔχει.

In the Wasps, 58 f., we find

> ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστ' οὔτε κάρυ' ἐκ φορμίδος
> δούλω διαρριπτοῦντε τοῖς θεωμένοις.

In Plutus, 797 ff.

> οὐ γὰρ πρεπῶδές ἐστι τῷ διδασκάλῳ
> ἰσχάδια καὶ τρωγάλια τοῖς θεωμένοις
> προβαλόντ', ἐπὶ τούτοις εἶτ' ἀναγκάζειν γελᾶν.

These passages prove what was the custom in the time of
Aristophanes. There was undoubtedly, then, an actual throwing
of the barley in Peace, 962 ff. The sacrifice is therefore being
offered in the orchestra, from which alone the barley could be
thrown among the spectators. Since the actors were in the
orchestra, the direction of Trygaios (1305 f.) to the chorus to eat
all that remains is easily understood, and the choreutae readily
join the procession which escorts the 'happy pair' from the
theatre at the end.

Aves.

It is necessary to ascend the bushy hillside (1, 92, 202, 208, 224, 265) in order to reach the mouth of the cavern where the Epops dwells (51 ff., 92, 646 ff.), for Euelpides declares (8) that he has worn off his toe-nails in following the directions of his Jackdaw, and asks the bird if he proposes to lead them down the rocks (20). From 1 to 51 the actors are plainly wandering hither and thither, in obedience to the motions of their feathery guides. This play, like the Prometheus and the Philoktetes, could not be 'set' on a 'stage,' and the actors have evidently entered by the parodos.

> 175.   βλέψον κάτω. Ep. καὶ δὴ βλέπω. Pei. βλέπε νῦν ἄνω.
> Ep. βλέπω. Pei. περίαγε τὸν τράχηλον. Ep. νὴ Δία,
> ἀπολαύσομαί τι δ', εἰ διαστραφήσομαι.

βλέψον κάτω has been cited as a strong argument that the actors were standing on a stage when these words were uttered (Müller, B.-A., S. 109). But the bushy hillside rising from the level of the orchestra offers practically as good an opportunity for looking down as does Müller's stage. The whole passage, however, is no more to be taken seriously than is the command to the sausage-seller (Knights, 169 ff.) to mount his dresser and take a look at the islands.

The first four birds (227 ff.) come apparently from different directions, for Peisth. says the second one comes from an unlucky quarter (275). The chorus proper appear in the parodos (296), and come slowly in, that their appearance may be duly appreciated. They are evidently at a distance when they ask (310) ποῦ μ' ἄρ' ὃς ἐκάλεσε; and they do not perceive the two strangers till after 326, when Epops calls their attention to the two mortals. In rage they exhort one another to attack the intruders (344). κύκλωσαι (345) implies that the birds can surround their enemies. The two men in terror seize on whatever comes to hand for protection (353, 357, 361), but the birds attack them at close quarters (364 ff.). Not till 480 does the Epops finally persuade them to retire. As in all the other scenes in which steps must be ascended to reach a stage, if a stage exists, there is no word of the text which signifies ascending. It is plain also that no impediment exists to the free intermingling of actors and chorus. The following scene, in which Peisth. explains his plans, gains

vastly when it is understood that the actor is not preaching to the birds from the top of a stage, but is talking to them as a sharer of the same scene with themselves.

The close (1720 ff.) but emphasizes the teaching of the earlier portions of the play. The chorus sings ἄναγε, δίεχε, πάραγε, πάρεχε, περιπέτεσθε, as Peisth. and his bride appear. The bridegroom, delighted with their hymn, invites them to follow in the marriage-train (1755); and, as he leads the way out dancing (1761) with his bride, the birds follow singing (1763 ff.).

Lysistrata.

Though Lysistrata has sent the older women to seize the citadel, her purpose in calling the assembly of the women is to persuade them to join in the movement. The acropolis is the goal to which they are to move, and immediately after the assembly of women have sworn to follow the leadership of Lysistrata, the shout of those who have taken possession of the citadel is heard from within. On the deep stage of the modern opera-house a street scene in the foreground, with an acropolis in the distance, is easily represented, and the audience readily believes that the cry from behind the scenes comes from the citadel. Stage or no stage, such scenic effects were impossible in the Greek theatre. If the cry is to be understood as coming from the acropolis, then the propylaia must be represented before the eyes of the audience at the moment when the cry is heard. This view is supported by the words of Lysistrata (246): ξυνεμ-βάλωμεν εἰσιοῦσαι τοὺς μοχλούς, words which imply entering the gates which are before them. No change of scene takes place then, and ἐξέρχεται (5), and φερέτω κύλικά τις ἔνδοθεν καὶ σταμνίον (199) imply actions which occurred before the acropolis entrance.

That the ascending road to the propylaia could not be represented on a 'stage' has been shown above. That it actually was represented we learn from 287 f.: λοιπόν ἐστι χωρίον | τὸ πρὸς πόλιν, τὸ σιμόν, οἳ σπουδὴν ἔχω. The scholion to τὸ σιμόν (Dübner, 288) explains τὸ σιμόν· ὄνομα χωρίου περὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἀντὶ τοῦ πρόσαντες. ἢ ὄνομα χωρίου (καὶ ἐν Βαβυλωνίοις "μέσην ἔρειδε πρὸς τὸ σιμόν"). καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Νίκαις τουτὶ προσαναβῆναι τὸ σιμόν δεῖ. τὸ σιμόν not only means an ascent, then, but was the name of the ascent leading to the acropolis. The absurdity of making the words refer to a flight of steps is apparent. That an inclined plane led from the orchestra to a 'stage' is equally incredible. As in the similar

scenes already discussed, the ground rises from the orchestra level to the front of the proskenion, on which is represented the required scene. This ascent, enough to give the suggestion of reality to the spectators, was not sufficient to prevent the free movement of actors and chorus, nor to serve as a barrier between them.

In 829 ff. Lysistrata, Myrrhina and the day guards appear, move and act on the wall above the entrance (864 and schol., 873 and schol., 883). As often remarked in the foregoing pages, the διστεγία, as it was possible above a stage, could not have afforded room for so many people. They appear on the roof of the proskenion.

The four orchestic movements 256–265, 271–280, 286–295, 296–305, were of course executed in the orchestra. At 306 the chorus of men turn to the gates of the acropolis, and, their burdens being deposited on the ground (307, 314), they prepare to set fire to the gates (308, 311, 316). They are here close in front of the gates, on the stage, if stage there be. Therefore the chorus of women, as they enter with water to the rescue of their fellow-women (318, 334), do not reach the men till after the orchestic movement (321–334, 335–349) in the orchestra is ended. Not till 350 do they approach the men, who turn to face them (352). All are on the same level, for the talk is of beating (357, 364), of seizing (359), of striking (360, 366); the women invite the men to come forward (365); the men threaten to scorch the women (376) and to burn their hair (381). The women reply by drenching their opponents with the contents of their water-pots. In this connection the scholiast is cited to prove that the women were on a stage above the men.

Schol. in 321 : πέτου, πέτου· νῦν ἐστιν ἡμιχόριον τὸ λέγον ἐκ γυναικῶν εἰσερχομένων ἄνωθεν, ἵνα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ αὐτῶν καταχέωσιν ἄνωθεν. τὸ δὲ ἄλλο ἡμιχόριον ἐξ ἀνδρῶν κάτωθεν ἐπερχομένων ταῖς ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει εἰς πολιορκίαν. The imagination of the scholiast has been caught by the drenching scene (381 ff.), and he wishes the effect of height for this. Hence arises his use of ἄνωθεν and κάτωθεν. We have noted above why the chorus of women came in on the level of the orchestra, it remains to give the reasons why they could not have entered on a 'stage.' The chorus of men has dragged their burden up the τὸ σιμόν (286, 287 ff.) and deposited it (306 ff.), so they can no longer be spoken of as coming up from below. Had the chorus of women entered on a 'stage,' their first orchestic movement[1]

_____
[1] Cf. Arnoldt, Die Chorparteien bei Euripides, S. 80 ff.

must have been performed there (321–349), and they must have remained till 541 ff. and performed this dance also on the 'stage.' For they are on the same level with the magistrate (386 ff.) Not till 539 do they announce that they leave their pitchers to engage in the dance.

But there are present on this 'stage' the chorus of women, the magistrate (387 ff.), the servants with the levers (424 ff.), Lysistrata (430 ff.), first woman (439 f.), second woman (443 f.), third woman (447 f.), at least four different policemen to contend with the four women (433 ff., 441 f., 445, 449, 451, 455, 462), and a crowd of women from the acropolis (456 ff.). That such numbers, in a scene of the liveliest possible action, could be accommodated on a Greek 'stage' is an utter impossibility, and we must simply infer that the scholiast to 321 had no better authority for his words than his own imagination.[1]

Though at the close of the play the text is very corrupt, and though many of the various readings have unquestionably been adapted with the view of making representation on a stage possible, it is yet clear that there is the easiest possible communication between the entrance to the acropolis and the orchestra. Actors and chorus, Spartans, Athenians, and the women all pass in and out with ease. Room for the dances of the Athenians and Spartans (1243, 1246, 1277, 1279, 1317) with their wives existed only in the orchestra, and therefore from the orchestra all departed at the end. In fact, for the Lysistrata the only means to avoid building the 'stage' on a level with the orchestra is to construct an orchestra on a level with the stage, which has been shown (Part I) to be an impossibility.

Thesmophoriazusae.

The assembly scene alone need claim our attention. Mnesikles, dressed as a woman, with his servant Thratta, approaches the Thesmophorion (279). They sacrifice a cake to the goddesses (285). Mnesikles offers prayer at the altar (286), and seeks a good place among the seats where he may sit down and listen to the orators (292 f.). The herald proclaims silence (295 f.). The prayers customary in opening an assembly are offered (296 ff.), in which the chorus join (312 ff.). The προβούλευμα is read (372 ff.). The call for speakers is given (379). The speaker is crowned

---

[1] For the discussion of the entire play see White, p. 202 ff.

before addressing the assembly (380). Two of the women leave their seats and come forward and speak (380, 443), followed by Mnesikles (466). Kleisthenes brings news that an intruder is among them (573), and joins in the search which follows (598 ff.), and, with the assistance of the choreutae, discovers the culprit (628 ff.). The chorus kindles torches and searches through the entire precinct, and has an active part to perform with the herald (312 ff.), as well as with the speakers (434 ff., 459 ff., 520 ff.) and with Kleisthenes (582 ff.). Mnesikles seizes the child from its nurse (689) and flees to the altar (693). In response to the mother's call for assistance the chorus advise to set him on fire. Throughout the entire scene actor is distinguishable from the chorus in no way ; all are together, and it need hardly be remarked that the orchestra alone affords the required space. As usual, we have emphatic testimony that actors and chorus must be together in important portions of the play, while no situation is discoverable which renders it either necessary or desirable that they be separated by a stage.

Ecclesiazusae.

The proskenion is most interesting because it must have represented several houses, before which, through the orchestra, ran a street of the city. Praxagora appears from her dwelling in the opening scene, as we learn from 310, when her husband enters under circumstances which render it necessary that he come directly from the house. At 491 also the chorus declares that they are again before the dwelling of their general. Later Praxagora wishes to creep in unobserved (511), but is prevented by the appearance of Blepyros (519). The greeting of the maid to the chorus and neighbors (1114 f.) testifies that the same house is visible to the end. The other dwellings are the house of the neighbor (34), of the first citizen (731 ff.), of the first old woman (977, 990, 997, 1005), of the young woman (962, 976, 989), of the second old woman (1093 ff.). Here are six dwellings mentioned as visible on the scene. It is about as hopeless to try and reconcile them with the three stage-doors of Pollux as it is to attempt to prove that they fronted on a narrow 'stage.'

The assembly scene is again interesting. The chorus enters at 30, the neighbor at 35, three others at 41 f., another 46, still another 49, two more at 51, and many at 52. All take seats (57), the rite of purification is travestied (128), the call for the speaker is given (130), and the orators are crowned (122, 131). Then the

leader instructs them what to do in the real assembly. Not only is the orchestra the only place large enough to contain such an assembly, but there is again absolutely no way of distinguishing actors, mutes and chorus till Praxagora and her companions hasten forth (284), to be followed by the chorus singing the ode 289–310.

The chorus reappear at 477, but stop in the shelter of the parodos wall to remove their disguises (cf. Müller, B.-A., S. 135). Praxagoras arrives (503) while they are still busy with this work, and bids her servant (509 f.) put the clothing in order. This command cannot be meant for the choreutae, for they respond to the direction to lay aside their garments (514 ff.). Orders are constantly given without mention of names, as in the Peace 937, 956, 960 f., 1100, 1193, and the Birds 435, 947, 958, 1309 (White, p. 182). Mistress and servant are therefore in the orchestra with the chorus.

Of καταβαίνεις (1152) and the procession with which the play closes enough has already been said in connection with the discussion of the Knights 147 ff. It is sufficient here to call attention to the fact that, while the text contains no hint of a 'stage,' actors and chorus are in the orchestra together at the beginning, middle and end of the play.

Ranae.

Because of the extraordinary nature of the scenes pictured on earth, on the Lake of Acheron and in Hades, doubts must ever exist as to how much was actually represented and how much was left to the imagination of the audience. It is impossible to assign a separate portion of the theatre to each of the above-mentioned localities. Therefore, if the scenery did not actually change, it was assumed by the poet the spectators would conceive the location of the action altered as often as he invited them to do so.

Dionysos and Xanthias enter the orchestra, for the latter is mounted on an ass (23, 25, 27, 31 f., 35). The god approaches the house of Herakles and raps (36). The interview with the hero being ended, Charon's boat appears (182, 188, 190, 202), Dionysos embarks (188, 190), and the voyage begins. Knowledge of the later λογείον has confused the scholiast to 181, so that he is in doubt whether Acheron is on the λογείον or in the orchestra. Since the god entered the orchestra in the beginning, we could hardly expect him to mount to a 'stage' to find the stream of Acheron. The full proof that he continues in the orchestra is found in the scene just after his landing in the under world. Here Dionysos is thoroughly frightened by the monsters which

Xanthias describes as present. When the Empusa appears, the god, in mortal terror, rushes to his priest, who occupies the seat of honor in the middle of the row of θρόνοι, crying (297) ἱερεῦ διαφύλαξόν μ' ἵν' ὦ σοι ξυμπότης. Of the actual running Xanthias gives testimony (301 ἴθ' ἧπερ ἔρχει. δεῦρο δεῦρ' ὦ δέσποτα). The scholiast declares that he runs and hides behind the chair of his priest, a statement which we readily accept after a comparison with the action of Theoria (Peace 906–7) and with that of the slave throwing barley to the spectators (Peace 962).

As is the case so often in Aristophanes, the final scene strongly supports the testimony of the earlier portions of the play, that no stage could have existed. The trial scene is over, and Aischylos is to return to the upper world. The numbers present again demonstrate that this scene has been acted in the orchestra. Pluto gives the command to the chorus (1524 ff.) φαίνετε τοίνυν ὑμεῖς τούτῳ | λαμπάδας ἱεράς, χ' ἅμα προπέμπετε | τοῖσιν τούτου τοῦτον μέλεσιν | καὶ· μολπαῖσιν κελαδοῦντες. The chorus obeys, and moves with Dionysos, Aischylos and Xanthias from the theatre.

Plutus.

But two scenes need mention. Chremylos bids Kario (222 f.) go forth and summon τοὺς ξυγγεώργους, who form the chorus. The servant obeys, and appears with them in the parodos (253 ff.), urging them to hasten to reach the house of his master. They threaten to club him (271 f.) for humbugging them, and after a few lines he declares that he will lead them in the dance (290 f.) which follows. In this last play of our poet, then, we find this testimony, which puts beyond question that actor and chorus are together in the orchestra, and no reason anywhere appears for the existence of a stage. In 1208 ff. we learn that the chorus again goes from the theatre in procession with the actors. Thus, in his last words, Aristophanes puts the seal of his condemnation on any theory which shall separate actors and chorus by any artificial difference of level.

The same striving after realism appears in the scenery of some of the plays of Euripides as in the tattered garments of certain of his characters. Nowhere in the two older tragedians are there such indications of realism as we find in the description of the temple in Iph. Taur. 70 ff., and of the metopes in Ion 190 ff. Instead of the usual palace, a peasant's hut is shown in the

Electra. The palace shakes in the Bacchae, and falls partially in ruins in Hercules Furens. In Andromache two buildings, the shrine and the palace, are shown. The burning on the roof of the palace in Orestes and the burning pyre in the Suppliants are entirely new features.

In Aristophanes the innovations are yet more marked. Heaven and earth are represented in the Peace; earth, Hades, and the stream of Acheron in the Frogs. Not only are two buildings on the scene in the Clouds, three in the Acharnians, and several in the Ecclesiazusae, but such passages as those where the actor will climb from the chimney or through a window in the Wasps, and sits at a window in Eccl., and burns down the Phrontisterion in the Clouds, also show a striking advance in the construction of scenery. The διστεγία is used to an extraordinary extent in the Peace. All these indications give warrant for believing that in the Knights and in the Lysistrata the entrance to the acropolis is accurately represented. The testimony of the dramas themselves fully proves that the actors and the chorus can no more be separated from each other by the barrier of a stage in the dramas of Euripides and Aristophanes than in those of Aischylos.

To compare in a word the summaries of the three periods of the classic drama as they have been considered in the foregoing pages, from the earliest play of Aischylos to the latest of Aristophanes, there is apparent a steady development in the scenery used. No fixed προσκήνιον could have fulfilled the requirements of the plays of the V century. The scene appropriate for each drama was erected on the floor of the orchestra, in front of the σκηνή.

The argument that in the V century no stage existed, that there was but one entrance, the πάροδος, on each side of the scene, and that actors, chorus and mutes all performed their respective parts in the orchestra may be summarized as follows:

1. The few instances in the dramas which at first glance favor the idea that a stage existed admit of other and more logical explanations.

2. Although there are very many passages in which the chorus is bidden to advance to the position occupied by actors, or to retire from this, in none of these passages is an expression used which can be construed as a direction to ascend or descend. Had a stage existed, some command to the chorus indicating the difference of level between stage and orchestra must have found its way into the text of some one, at least, of these passages.

3. In situations where there is no call for them to be on a 'stage,' the choreutae make minute observations concerning actors or scenery, observations which they could not make from the orchestra over the edge of the so-called 'stage.' Cf. Aiax 346, 364, 911 f.; Soph. Elect. 818; Trach. 964 ff.; Philoc. 861; Alcest. 98 ff., 392; Hec. 486 f.; Herc. Fur. 748, 1029; Orest. 208 ff.

Actors, on entering, see and converse with the choreutae first, though actors are present and the situation demands that they be first addressed. Cf. Persae 249 ff.; Oed. Rex 924; Soph. Elect. 660 ff., 1098 ff.; Philoc. 219; Eur. Elect. 109 ff.; Cyc. 96.

4. Where no mention is made of actual personal contact, the relations between actors and chorus are of so intimate a character that no barrier could have existed between them. Cf. Septem 677 ff.; Choeph. 983; Trach. 141 ff., 531 ff., 663 ff.; Oed. Rex 327, 648, 1047, 1339, 1413; Antig. 160 ff., 940 ff., 988 ff., 1155; Soph. Elect. 121 ff., 824 ff.; Philoc. 581, 825, 887, 983; Orest. 132 ff.; Eurip. Suppl. 1114 ff.; Phoeniss. 293 ff.; Ion 1249 ff.; Hecuba 484 ff.; Iph. Taur. 1068 f.; Cyc. 451 ff.; Aves 431 ff.

Here may be mentioned: *a*. The scenes in which it is proposed that the chorus enter the σκηνή, or in which this action actually occurs. Cf. Agamem. 1343 ff.; Aiax 329; Andromache 817 f.; Hecuba 1042 f.; Cyc. 590 ff., 630 ff.; Ion 219; Hippol. 782 ff.; Med. 1275; Hel. 331 ff.

b. The 'libation scenes.' Cf. Pers. 597 ff.; Choeph. 16 ff., 100 ff.; Iph. Taur. 159 ff.; Pax 941 ff., 970.

c. Where the chorus stands by actors as a guard. Cf. Aiax 1182; Oed. Col. 638, 724, 803, 811, 815, 835; Heracl. 69 ff., 274; Eq. 246.

5. The choreutae actually engage in strife with actors or with each other in the immediate presence of actors. Cf. Agamem. 1650 ff.; Oed. Col. 857 ff.; Philoc. 1003 ff.; Hel. 1628 ff.; Rhes. 675 ff.; Achar. 280 ff., 564 ff.; Eq. 247 ff., 451; Vesp. 453 ff.; Av. 364 ff.

Blows are threatened in Cyc. 210 ff.; Herc. Fur. 254.

The choreutae hand objects to actors in Eq. 490 ff., 919 ff.

They 'pledge right hands' with mutes: Heracl. 305 ff.

They stand with actors, bidding them farewell: Herc. Fur. 522 ff.

They approach the proskenion in company with actors: Herc. Fur. 1109 f.; Philoc. 144 ff.

6. In 'search scenes' the chorus is on ground usually occupied by actors, with no suggestion in the text that the choreutae are in

an unusual position. Cf. Eumen. 255 ff.; Aiax 865 ff.; Oed. Col. 116 ff.; Thes. 655 ff.

7. Chorus and actors enter together, or by the same entrance, or to the same portion of the scene. Cf. Aesch. Suppl. 1; Prom. 127; Choeph. 20; Oed. Col. 116; Philoc. 1; Soph. Elect. 120; Ion 184; Eur. Elect. 167; Bac. 1; Troad. 153 ff.; Plut. 252.

8. It may almost be said to be customary for actors and chorus to leave the theatre together by the parodos at the end of the play. Cf. Aesch. Supp. 980 ff.; Pers. 1000 ff.; Sept. 1068 ff.; Eum. 1003 ff.; Aiax 1403 ff.; Philoc. 1469 ff.; Trach. 1264 ff.; Troad. 1266 ff.; Eur. Suppl. 1232 ff.; Cyc. 702 ff.; Ion 1619 ff.; Pax 1333 ff.; Vesp. 1516 ff.; Achar. 1231 ff.; Eccl. 1165 ff.; Av. 1763 ff.; Lys. 1289 ff.; Ran. 1524 ff.; Plut. 1208 ff. Such a procession also occurs in Alc. 741, 861.

9. The 'stage' could not contain the actors, mutes and decorations in Aesch. Suppl. 218 ff., 463 ff., 755, 885; Septem 1 ff., 95 ff., 861 ff.; Eum. 480 ff.; Oed. Rex 1 ff.; Phoeniss. 1484 ff.; Eur. Suppl. 1 ff., 815 ff.; Cyc. 1 ff.; Hipp. 57 ff.; Iph. Aul. 1338 ff.; Achar. 42 ff.; Lysis. 456 ff.; Thes. 295 ff.; Eccl. 57 ff. Even if a 'stage' had existed, actors and mutes were in the orchestra in Eum. 1 ff.; Pax 462 ff., 906; Av. 1 ff.; Ran. 297; Achar. 1224 ff.

10. Certain plays could not have been 'set' on the so-called stage because—

a. A hillside was represented in Prom., Philoc., Eur. Elect. (489 ff.), Cyc., Lysist., Aves.

b. The altar, grove or shrine present required space, apart from the building in the background, only to be found in the orchestra in Choeph., Oed. Col., Heracl., Andr., Hel., Eur. Suppl.

c. The burning pyre (Eurip. Suppl. 1012 ff.) and the burning house (Nub. 1445 ff.) could not have been located on a stage.

d. Scenes with chariots and animals were possible only in the orchestra. Cf. Aesch. Suppl. 180 ff. (?); Pers. 149 (607), 1001; Agam. 782 ff.; Oed. Col. 312; Troad. 569 ff.; Eur. Elect. 987 ff.; Iph. Aul. 607 ff.; Vesp. 170 ff.; Ran. 23 ff.

JOHN PICKARD.

II.—THE SATURNIAN METRE.

Second Paper.

§4. A Modified Accentual Theory Proposed.

The rule for the accentuation of Saturnian verse, with its three clauses—(*a*) *that the accent falls on the first syllable of each line,* (*b*) *that 4-syllabled words took a secondary accent at the beginning of the line, words of more than 4 syllables at any part of the line,* (*c*) *that exactly three accents are found in the first hemistich, exactly two in the second*—we have found to suit the actual accentuation of the extant lines, while the quantitative scheme broke down when tested by the actual quantities occurring in them. But does this rule comprise the whole scheme of Saturnian versification ? Does the metre, the poetical element of the line, depend merely on there being three incidences of stress in one half, and two in the other, beginning with the first syllable of the line ? If it does, what would prevent a large number of sentences in, let us say, Cicero's speeches from possessing Saturnian metre ? The opening sentence of the First Philippic, for example : Ántequam dè-república, || pátres conscrípti, Dícam-ea quaè-dicénda || hoc-témpore árbitror ! ! There must surely be some other factor beside this. I contend that there are two others, and that to these two no regard, or at least far too little regard, is generally paid by accentual theorists. One of these factors is the number of syllables in each hemistich. Syllable-counting is the main element in Aryan metre; it is one of the principal elements in modern Italian and Romance metres generally. It is only natural that it should have played a considerable part in the native metre of the Latins. To the rule of accent just mentioned we must add : (2) *the normal number of syllables is* 7 *in the first hemistich,* 6 *in the second.* To secure 7 syllables with three accents in the first hemistich, the constituents of the line will be (*a*) dissyllable + dissyllable + trisyllable, e. g. *Dábunt málum Metélli,* v. 47 *Fúndit, fúgat, prostérnit,* (*b*) quadrisyllable (with main and secondary accent) + trisyllable, e. g. v. 2 *Dùönóro óptumo,* v. 53 *Àrgénteo polúbro.* Sometimes (*c*) dissyllable + quinqui-

syllable, e. g. 20 *Mágna sàpiéntia.* Or even (*d*) monosyllable+
trisyllable+trisyllable, e. g. 66 *Mé carpénto uehénte*, 68 *Nám
diuína Monétas.* Of course these dissyllables, trisyllables, etc.,
may be not single words but word-groups, e. g. 84 *Iámqu(e) eīus-
méntem fortúna*, 110 *Éï uénit in-méntem.* The normal number
of 6 syllables with two accents in the second hemistich is most
naturally made up by (*a*) trisyllable+trisyllable, e. g. *Naéuio
poétae*, 21 *pósidet hoc-sáxsum*, 24 *is-loceis mandátus*, but occasion-
ally by (*b*) quadrisyllable+dissyllable, e. g. 1 *coséntiont Rómāi*,
83 *Prosérpina púer*, 70 *inportúnae úndae.* The second hemistich,
however, occasionally appears with only 5 syllables, e. g. 2 *fuíse
uíro.* This normal number of syllables for the two hemistichs is
apparently departed from in those cases where the poet avails
himself of the license of substituting two short syllables for an
accented syllable, e. g. in the first hemistich, 12 *Sŭbĭgit ómne
Loucánam*, and sometimes in the second, e. g. 14 *cắpĭtibus opértis;*
though that the departure is more apparent than real we see from
the fact that a short syllable after an accented syllable tended to
suffer syncope in Latin, e. g. *surgit* from *surrigit, optimus* from
opitumus, caldus from *calidus*, so that a short accented syllable
followed by another short syllable would not fall on the ear with
much more force than a single syllable. Similarly in v. 15 *inge-
nium* would not sound very differently from *ingenīum* of three
syllables. This 'resolution,' as we may call it, of a single syllable
into two short syllables is also permitted in the pretonic syllable
in the first hemistich, e. g. 103 *Plĕriqu(e)-ómnes sŭbĭgúntur*, and
in the second, e. g. 56 *fíliam Cắlўpsónem*, to explain which we
need only refer to such scansions in Plautus as *ministérium*, or
minsterium (Pseud. 772), while v. 16 *licŭíset*, 8 *săpiénsque*, etc.,
would sound very like trisyllables. That this increase, real or
apparent, of the normal number of syllables in a hemistich was
recognized as a license, a permissible departure from the regular
usage, is shown by the strict limits within which it is confined.
In the first place, the extra syllable is always a short syllable,
which is preceded by another short syllable belonging to the
same word (see on vv. 13, 14, 37), and which either immediately
follows or immediately precedes the main accent of the word.
In the second place, two such 'resolutions' of syllables are not
permitted in the same hemistich (see on vv. 17, 38, 62, 67, 133,
134, 137), and probably not in the same line (see on vv. 33, 38,
49, 63, 113, 133). In other cases where the line seems to exhibit

a redundancy of syllables, it will be found that elision, the laws for which, as well as for hiatus, are definite and easily ascertainable (see below), restrained it in pronunciation within the proper number, e. g. 91 *Prím(a) incêdit Céreris*, so that Thurneysen's refusal to acknowledge the counting of syllables as a factor in Saturnian metre is really only justified by those second hemistichs with 5, instead of 6, syllables.

The other factor, to which I would give equal prominence, is the alternation of the accentual rhythm. Using the terms 'falling' accent, to describe the pronunciation of a word like *dábunt, málum, Naévio,* 'rising' accent, to describe that of *Metélli, poétae,* we may state our rule thus: (3). *After the first two 'feet' of the line, a regular alternation of accentual rhythm is sought, a 'rising' accent being followed by a 'falling,' and vice versa.* An example or two will make my meaning clearer. The normal form of the first hemistich is *Dábunt málum Metélli,* with 'rising' accentual rhythm, *Metélli* following on the 'falling' rhythm of the first two feet, *Dábunt málum.* To a first hemistich of this normal form (the A-type, we may call it) is almost always joined a second hemistich of this form: *Naéuio poétae,* with 'falling' rhythm, *Naéuio,* followed by 'rising' rhythm, *poétae* (the normal form, or A-type, of the second hemistich). There is another form of the first hemistich found (the B-type, it may be called), where the third 'foot' exhibits, not 'rising' but 'falling' accentual rhythm, e. g. v. 1 *Hónc oíno ploírume;* to which is regularly joined a corresponding by-form (B-type) of second hemistich: *coséntiont Rómaī,* with 'rising' followed by 'falling' rhythm, the aim of this combination evidently being to secure as far as possible a regular alternation of 'falling' and 'rising' rhythm throughout the line. Here are some more examples:

(*a*) A-type of both hemistichs. (So in the large majority of lines):—

> 45. Uírum míhi, Caména, ‖ ínsece uersútum
> 58. Pártim érrant, nequínont ‖ Graéciam redíre, etc., etc.

When the second hemistich is made up of a quadrisyllable and dissyllable, its A-type is like this:

> 116. adlocútus súmmi.
> 117. regnatórem márum.

(*b*) B-type of both:—

> 2. Dùönóro óptumo ‖ fuíse uíro
> 40. Úno còmplúrimae ‖ conséntiunt géntes

41. Pópuli prìmárium ‖ fuísse uírum
47. Néquĕ tam té oblítŭs-sum, ‖ Laértie nóster.
83. Prím(a) incédit Céreris ‖ Prosérpina púer
111. Sín íllos déserant ‖ fortíssimos uíros,

while a line like v. 27 departs from the perfect B-type in the last foot of the line only :—

27. Mágna sàpiéntia ‖ multásque uirtútes.

Here, apparently, is the explanation of these anomalous second hemistichs with 5, instead of 6, syllables, like v. 41 *fuisse uirum*. They were allowed by the writer because they satisfied this rule of alternation of accentual rhythm, although they were irregular in that other respect, in the same way as we see other departures from the normal form tolerated for the sake of securing some effect, such as alliteration or rhyme.

With regard to *alliteration*, it is plain that it does not play the part that it does in Early Teutonic verse, where it constitutes the chief element of the rhythm, the emphatic word of the first half-line alliterating in its first (i. e. its accented) syllable with the emphatic word of the second half-line. In the Latin Saturnian, alliteration is nothing but an ornament, used or not, as the caprice of the poet directs. And yet it must have bulked largely in Saturnian poetry, as we can see partly from the large number of instances of its occurrence in the few lines of Saturnian metre preserved to us, and quite as much from its prevalence in the older Latin poetry in other metres. It is a frequent ornament of the lines of Plautus, Ennius, Lucilius, and Lucretius, rarer in Terence, and still rarer in subsequent poets (Jordan, Symb., p. 171 sqq.). In Ennius' Annals we have, according to Reichardt's statistics (in Fleck. Jahrb. 1887, p. 777 sqq.), no fewer than 45 examples of alliteration of two neighboring words in the first hemistich, 85 in the second, while the instances of three neighboring words alliterating are 7 (in first hemistich), 14 (in second), 7 (divided between first and second hemistich); in all there are 205 alliterations in 422 (complete) lines, of which 188 are cases of alliteration of consonants, 17 of vowels. In Saturnian poetry too the only designed alliteration seems to be that of neighboring words (see on vv. 11, 20, 49, 50, 97, 137), and consonants are far more frequently alliterative than vowels; it is not, as in Teutonic and Irish poetry, confined to accented syllables (e. g. 76 *fortúna* ‖ *fécerat*), and can hardly be said to attach itself only to the two

most important words of the line, although it undoubtedly must have had the effect of giving prominence to the word whose first syllable showed its operation, e. g. 45 *còmplúrimae* ‖ *conséntiunt*, 46 *Pópuli prìmárium* (with secondary accent on the first syllable of these quadrisyllables in the middle of the line), 131 *Pátrem súum suprémum* (not *Patrém-suum*).

Rhyme was another ornament much sought after, in the final syllable of each hemistich, so that the regular structure of the line seems occasionally to be sacrificed for the sake of securing it, e. g. v. 101 :

> Úrit, populátur, uástat ‖ rem-hóstium concínnat,

instead of the usual rhythm : *Úrit, uástat, populátur,* like v. 47 *Fúndit, fúgat, prostérnit.* (On the prevalence of rhyme and alliteration in Early Latin poetry see Buchold, De paromoeoseos apud veteres Romanorum poetas usu, Leipzig, 1883.)

Lastly falls to be mentioned a possible feature of Saturnian poetry, which the scantiness of our material does not allow us to posit with certainty, namely, the arrangement of lines, usually or occasionally, in distichs. It must have struck any one who read through the lists on pp. 144–156 that, when, as rarely happens, two neighboring lines from the Odyssea or the Bellum Punicum have been preserved to us, there is usually a correspondence of structure between the two, any peculiarity of rhythm in the first line being echoed by the rhythm of the second. This fact, if true, should be a strong argument against altering the text in the irregular first hemistichs of vv. 68–9 :

> Námque núllum péius ‖ mácerat humánum,
> Quámde máre saéuom ‖ uís-et-cui sunt-mágnae,

and agrees with our reading in the second hemistichs of vv. 116–17 :

> Sénex, frétus pietáti, ‖ adlocútus súmmi
> Régis frátrem Neptúnum, ‖ regnatórem márum ;

but the number of quotations by the grammarians of more than a single Saturnian line are so few that we have not data enough to warrant a certain inference.

So much for the metrical structure and ornamentation of Saturnian verse. It only remains to determine the usage observed in it with regard to *elision* and *hiatus*. This is very simple, and very easily determined : (1). A final short vowel is elided before an initial vowel or *h-* ; (2). A final long vowel, or vowel

preceding final -*m*, is normally not elided, but shortened. A monosyllabic enclitic like *te*, *si*, *qui* is, however, elided (vv. 16, 18, 30, 13). Instances of elision are: v. 83 *Prím(a) incédit Céreris*, v. 103 *Plériqu(e)-ómnes subigúntur*. Instances of hiatus (*hiatus prosodiacus*): v. 77 *Múltĭ ălĭĭ e- Tróia*, v. 2 *Dùönóró óptumo*. In the case of ablatives like v. 53 *aureo eclutro*, a line of Livius, the old final -*d* may play a part (cf. v. 123). Hiatus proper, i. e. the retention of a short vowel unelided, or of a long vowel or a syllable in -*m* unshortened, is probably allowed between the hemistichs (e. g. v. 50; cf. below vv. 169, 183, etc.), but the instances are too few to enable us to decide satisfactorily. The prevalence of 'hiatus prosodiacus' in Saturnian verse is in keeping with the use of elision and hiatus in all the older poetry. Hiatus was far commoner in Plautus than in Terence (Klotz, Altröm. Metrik, pp. 102 sqq.), in Naevius than in Ennius (if we may so construe the words of Cicero, Or. 45, 152 saepe hiabant, ut Naevius . . . at Ennius semel etc.). The usage of Saturnians gives us support for such lines of Ennius as Ann. 336 *militŭm octo*, 486 *dum quidĕm unus* (cf. Prisc. I, p. 30 K), not to mention 275 *inimicitiām agitantes* (see above, p. 166), and also shows us that his *Scipiŏ inuicte* (Ann. 321) is not an imitation of Greek usage, but the native Latin treatment of a long vowel before another vowel (cf. *Chĭus*, *Pellaĕus*).

We may now proceed to an application of our rules to the lines on pp. 144–156, and to a critical examination of those fragments and doubtful lines which we reserved for later discussion. Before doing so it will be well to refer to the subject of *caesura*, a feature to which I have intentionally refrained from giving the prominence usually attached to it; for, in my view, the rules of caesura which can be drawn up for Saturnian verse are dependent on the three main rules of accentuation, number of syllables, and alternation of accentual rhythm, and are implied by them. The only caesura that really formed of itself an element of Saturnian metre was the break between the two hemistichs; the others, viz. the occasional break between the first and second 'feet' of the first hemistich, and the usual breaks (1) between the second and third 'feet' of the first hemistich (Caesura Korschiana), (2) between the first and second 'feet' of the second hemistich, are merely the conditions under which a certain number and arrangement of accents, combined with a certain number of syllables, can be secured for the line.

§5. The Correct Scansion and Reading of the Fragments.

The three main factors of Saturnian metre we have seen to be accentuation, counting of syllables, alternation of rhythm, the three rules which concern them being these:

(1). The accent must fall on the first syllable of each line. There must be three accents in the first hemistich; two must be reckoned in the latter hemistich. A secondary accent is taken into account, necessarily or optionally, according to its prominence in current pronunciation.

(2). The normal number of syllables is 7 in the first hemistich, 6 in the second. An extra short syllable in positions where in current pronunciation it would be completely, or partially, suppressed is occasionally allowed to count with a preceding short syllable as a single syllable.

(3). After the first two 'feet' an alternation of rhythm, between 'rising' and 'falling' accentuation, is aimed at throughout the line.

The ornaments of Saturnian verse for the sake of which these rules, especially (2) and (3), are occasionally relaxed in less artificial poetry are—1. Alliteration (of the initial syllables of neighboring words); 2. Rhyme (of the final syllable, or syllables, of each hemistich). There are also traces of an arrangement in distichs, the two lines of the stanza echoing each other's rhythm and structure.

Let us now use the extant fragments to exemplify and test these rules. I follow the order observed on pp. 144–156, and begin with the lines from inscriptions. These cannot be expected to be as regular as the lines of a poet like Livius Andronicus, no more than the hexameters on early inscriptions can bear comparison with the hexameters of Ennius.

By the A-type I mean this form of line: $x'x(,) x'x, xx'x, \| x'xx, xx'x$ (sometimes $\| xxx'x, x'x$); e. g.

<div align="center">Dábunt málum Metélli ‖ Naéuio poétae.</div>

By the B-type: $x'x(,) x'x, x'xx \| xx'xx, x'x$ (with modifications of the second hemistich, e. g. $\| xx'x, x'x$); e. g.

<div align="center">Prím(a) incédit Céreris ‖ Prosérpina púer.</div>

I indicate the quantity of doubtful syllables, and all cases of 'resolution' of syllables.

1. Hónc oíno ploírume || coséntiont R*ómāi*

With B-type of both hemistichs (which would be spoilt by reading *Romane*), and so perfectly regular, except that the first hemistich has 6 instead of 7 syllables. The first hemistich of v. 5 Hec cepit Corsica, and v. 121 Sin illos deserant, have the same defect, the first word in all three cases being a monosyllable which was originally a dissyllable, *honce, hece, sine.* The -*ai* of the locative cannot have been dissyllabic.

2. Dùönórŏ óptumo || fŭíse uíro

Again with B-type of both hemistichs. The second hemistich has 5 instead of 6 syllables, but retains alternation of rhythm to the end of the line, along with rhyme. The word *duonos* seems to be trisyllabic in both instances of its occurrence in the Saturnian fragments (cf. v. 135, a line of Naevius), though *duellum* is, as always in Plautus, a dissyllable in v. 49 (from an inscription later than Livius and Naevius). *Duellum* is a trisyllable in Ennius, Ann. 168 M.: pars occidit illa duellis.

3. Lúcĭom Scìpióne || fílio*m* Barbáti.
4. Cónsol, cénsōr, aidílis || híc-fŭet apúd-uos.

The other possible accentuation, *hic-fŭet*, would give type B of the second hemistich with type A of the first, an unusual combination.

5. Héc cépit Córsica || Alériaqu(e)-úrbe

On the defective number of syllables in the first hemistich, see the note on v. 1. The accentuation of *Aleriamque* is very difficult to determine. Standing alone it would be pronounced *Áleria* (cf. p. 162), or, if the Greek accent was followed, *Aleria* (cf. 'Αλαλία, 'Αλερία).

6. Dédet Tèmpestátebus || aíde mérĕtod

The second hemistich is irregular, both in its rhythm (x′x, x′xx instead of a (modified) B-type xx′x, x′xx, e. g. *hec-aide mẽretod*, and in lacking one from the usual number of syllables. *Merẽtod* is of course impossible.

7. Còrnélius Lúcĭus || Scípio Barbátus

With the A-instead of the B-type, of second hemistich, owing to the exigencies of the proper name. *Lucĭus*, if permissible, would give the A-type to I, and harmonize I with II.

8. Gnaíuod pátre prognátus || fórtĭs-uir săpĭénsque

Fortis-uir makes a word-group like our 'gentleman,' *bone-vir* Plaut., etc.

9. Quoìŭs fórmă uirtútei || parísumă fŭit

The B-type of hemistich II is not in keeping with the A-type of I. We cannot venture to substitute an A-type by scanning *párĭsuma* fuit, for superlatives do not seem to tolerate this shortening of the antepenultima, so that *simillumaé-sunt* of Plaut. Asin. 241 is probably wrong (Class. Rev. VI, p. 242).

10. Cónsol, cénsōr, aidílis || queí-fŭit apúd-uos

More probably than *quei-fŭit*, by note on v. 4. The natural order of the words 'aedile, consul, censor' (as in the prose epitaph, I 31) is transposed for the sake of getting an accented syllable at the beginning of the line; cf. v. 12.

11. Taùrásia, Cisaúna, || Sámniō cépit

The second hemistich is a syllable short. If the alliteration between *Cisauna* and *cepit* is designed, we have an example of alliteration of words not contiguous.

12. Sŭbĭgit ómne Loucánam, || ópsidesqu(e) abdoúcsit

Sŭbigit is used, not *subégit*, because the first syllable of the line must be accented (cf. v. 10). The versification of Plautus points to elided -*que* having been disregarded in accentuation, e. g. Pseud. 574 prósperĕqu(e); Poen. 545 otiósequ(e); 763 aúrumqu(e); 1101 surrúptasqu(e); 1218 líbertátiqu(e); 1345 ingénuasqu(e).

13. Qu(ei)-ăpĭc(e) insígne Diális || fláminis gesístei

Or else *Queí-ăpic(e)*, which, however, makes the first hemistich too long. Both -*ei* and -*em* seem to be elided here.

14. Mórs perfécit tū(a)-ut-éssent || ómnia bréuia

Or *tŭ(a)-ŭt-éssent* with resolution of the pretonic syllable. The rhythm in hem. II is unusual (cf. v. 18).

15. Hónos, fămă, uirtúsque, || glóri(a) atqu(e) ingĕnĭum

The conjunction *atque* has no accent (cf. Prisc. Partit. IX 170, p. 500 K.), at least when its last syllable is elided. See instances of *ătqu(e)* after a short syllable in Plautus: Müller, Plaut. Pros., p. 293.)

16. Quìbŭs s(ei)-in-lónga lĭcŭíset || tib(e) útier uíta

Irregular, with two resolutions of syllables in the same hemistich (an irregularity which would have been removed by the use of *Queis* for *Quibus*); also with type B of second and type A of first hemistich. The unemphatic *tibĕ* has no accent, but is necessary to give 6 syllables to the hemistich.

17. Fácĭle fácteis sŭpĕráses ‖ glóriam maiórum

Echoes the irregularity of the preceding line, with two resolutions in the first hem., a fact which points against the supposition that *facile* was pronounced here *facul* (cf. Fest. 266, 20 Th.), or *superases* like **suprasses.* *Facile factis*, e. g. Plaut. Poen. 307 (with 3-syll. *facile*), Merc. 855.

18. Quá-re lúbens t(e)-in-grĕmĭu, ‖ Scípio, récipit

Recĕpit or *recĭpiet* would be a more regular ending, giving the usual A-type to hem. II (but cf. v. 14).

19. Térră, Públi, prognátum ‖ Públio, Cornéli
20. Mágna sàpiéntia, ‖ multásque uirtútes,

If the alliteration between *magna* and *multasque* be designed, we have an example of alliteration between words which are not contiguous.

21. Aĕtáte quom-párua, ‖ pósidet hoc-sáxsum

Though spelt by the graver *aetate*, the usual spelling of the time, the word has the scansion of *aeuitate*, the older form, used in the XII Tables, etc. Similarly *aeuiternus* occurs for *aeternus* in Varro, Sat. Men. 437 B., and elsewhere; cf. Prisc. I, p. 81 K. We have *aeterni*, scanned as *aeuiterni*, on an iambic epitaph of Diocletian's time (Orell. 6017): divíni vis est aéterni témporis.

22. Quoíei uítă defécit ‖ nón-honos honóre

The accentuation *nón-honos* seems justified by the ictus in Plautus' lines, e. g. Amph. 379 égo sum, nón tu, Sósia; Rud. 136 Venerí paráui . . . nón mihi, etc.

23. Ís hic sítus, quei núnquam ‖ uíctus-est uirtútei

Is emphatic, *hic* subordinate; cf. Plaut. Truc. 335 Sed quíd haĕc, Poen. 619 Sed quíd hŭc, etc., Klotz, p. 70.

24. Ánnos gnátus uigínti ‖ ís-loceis mandátus

Is-loceis, of doubtful reading and sense, I make dat. pl. of *is locus*, like *ilico*, abl. sg. (= *eo loco*), v. 106, with that confusion of *is* and *hic* which is found in writers contemporary with this inscription, c. 130 B. C., on which see Bach in Studem. Stud. 2, 361 (cf. note on v. 57 above). *Is-loceis* can hardly be abl. pl. with the sense of *ilico* 'forthwith,' *mandatus* governing *honore* in next line, though it might be a graver's error for *his* (rather *heis*) *loceis*; or, as it is generally construed, *is* may be nom. sg., leaving *loceis* rather difficult to explain.

25. Né-quairátis honóre || queí-mǐnǔs-sit mandátus

    Or *Nè-quairátis*; cf. Bücheler, Umbrica, p. 171.

With almost entire suppression of the subst. verb *sit.* The line is, like the preceding, difficult to construe, and therefore difficult to accentuate. I understand it so : ne quaeratis quî minus honos sit mandatus. But it may mean : ne quaeratis honorem, qui non sit (est?) mandatus, a rendering which would probably require the accentuation *quei-minǔs-sit* (echoing an *is lóceis* or *is diueis* in the preceding line?), if we may judge from the dramatist's usage as shown in lines like Amph. 986 quí minus ?, Pseud. 160 Numquí minús ea grátia ?, Rud. 218 quí minǔs séruio ?, etc., with interrogative *quî*, but Andr. 700 quo mínus haec fíerent núptiae, Phorm. 41 eí qui mínus habent, etc., with relative *qui, quo.* This is perhaps favored by the alliteration of *minǔs-sit* with *mandatus.*

26. Quód ré-sua diseídens || ásperĕ afleícta

    Or *Quòd.*

27. Párens tímens heic-uóuit || uótŏ-hoc solúto

28. Décŭma fácta, poloúcta, || leíbereis lubéntes

29. Dónu dánunt Hércolei || máxsume mérĕto

    Not quite type B of II.

30. Sémŏl tĕ-órant se uóti || crébro condémnes

    Or *Sémol t(e)-órant.*

31. Dúctu, aùspício, || impérioqu(e) eíus

The double accentuation of *auspicio* is strange. For the single of 4-syllabled *imperioqu(e)* cf. vv. 5, 12.

32. Àcháïa cápta, || Corínto deléto

33. Rómam rĕdǐeit triúmphans. || ob-hásce-res bĕnĕ-géstas

    Or *ob-hásc(e)-res.*

Bene-gerere is a word-group like *bene volo, benevolens.* So *bène-rém-geras* v. 38, *bene-iouent* v. 44. The line seems to suffer from a redundancy of syllables, with its double resolution. Should we pronounce *redit* or *ben(e) gestas*? cf. below v. 38.

34. Quòd in-béllo uóuerat || hanc-aédĕm et sígnu

35. Hèrculìs-Uictóris || imperátor dédicat

    A questionable accentuation of I and a syllable too many in II.

36. Hóc est-fáctum mŏnŭméntum || Maárco Caicílio

37. Hóspes, grát(um)-est qu(om) apúd-meãs || restitístei seédes

    Or *quòm ăpúd-meãs.*

38. Bĕnĕ-rém-geras et uálĕas ; || dórmias sǐnĕ-qúra

    Or *Bèn(e)-rém-geras.*

On *bene-rem-gerere* see note on v. 33, and cf. Plaut. Aul. 248 male rém gerat, Stich. 402 béne re gésta, Trin. 901 bene rém

gerébat, 1182 béne re gésta, etc. The double resolution in the first hemistich would be avoided by pronouncing *ben(e)-rem-geras* (cf. *benficium, malficium*, etc.) in the line by substituting *se-qúra* for *sine-qúra*.

39. Gònlégium [quod est] acíptum || aetáteï agédaī
    Perhaps *aётat(ei)-agédai*. For the word-group *aetatem-agere* cf. Plaut. Trin. 229. 232 ; Enn. Trag. 221 R.

40. Ópïpar(um) ad-ueítam quolúndam || festósque díes

41. Queï soùeis-astútieis || opídque Uolgáni
    Or *Queì soúeis astútieis.*

42. Gòndécŏrant saipíssume || comuíuiā loidósque

43. Qúqueï hùc-dedérunt || imperatóribus súmmeis
    Huc, i. e. *hoc*, is scanned like *hocce*. See on v. 1.

44. Útei sésed lubéntes || bĕnĕ-iouent optántis
    Beneiouent is written on the inscription as one word.

In this inartistic inscription of the Faliscan cooks, vv. 39–44, I take *quod est* to be an insertion like *ad laevam* in the so-called 'iambics' of C. I. L. I 1027. *Saipissume, imperatoribus,* and perhaps *astutieis*, have only one accent.

45. Úno còmplúrimae || conséntiunt géntes

46. Pópuli prìmárium || fuísse uírum

I give a double accentuation to (alliterative) *complurimae* and *primarium*, but not to *consentiunt*. The reading *complurimae* is favored both by the alliteration and by the 'echo' of the other line of the distich.

47. Fúndit, fúgat, prostérnit || máxumas lĕgïónes

48. Mágnum nŭmĕrum triúmphat || hóstibus deuíctis

49. Dūéllo mágno dïrïméndo, || régibus sŭbïgéndis

The alliteration (if *dw-* alliterates with *d-*, cf. Plaut. *domi dūel-lique*) would almost require *Mágno dūéllo diriméndo*. The double resolution of syllables in the same line is perhaps allowed for the sake of the rhyme.

50. Uírum mìhi, Caména, || ínsecĕ uersútum

With hiatus between first and second hemistich. *Mihi* must here have a certain amount of stress. Is the alliteration between *uirum* and *uersutum* designed?

51.· Mèa-púĕra quid-uérbi || ex-tu(o)-óre súpra
    Or *ex-tūo-óre.*

52. Néquĕ tam tĕ-oblítŭs-sum, || Laértie nóster

53. Àrgénteo polúbro, || aúreŏ eclútro
    Notice the dissyllabic rhyme. Cf. v. 49.

54. Tú-quae mìhi-narráto || ómniă disértim
55. Mátrem próci procítum || plúrimi uenérunt

Proci suits the line of Homer as well as *meam*, would be as easily omitted by a careless scribe, and, besides, enhances the alliteration. Even reading *meam*, the natural accentuation would be *Mátrem méam*, for the possessive would gain some stress from the alliteration. See on v. 131.

56. Quándo díes aduĕnĭet || quem-profáta Mórt(a) est   •
    Or *Mórtast.*
59. Ìbĭdémque uir-súmmus || ádprimus Patróclus

Uir-súmmus is a word-group like *fortĭs-uir* v. 8. *Ádprimus*, as remarked above (p. 150), is doubtful. In Plaut. and Ter. we have incidence of ictus sometimes on the first, sometimes on the second syllable. *Pátricoles* (the form used by Ennius, Trag. 314 R.) *adprimus* would save both the rhyme and the A-type.

60. Pártĭm érrant, nequínont || Graéciam redíre
61. Àpud-nýmphăm, Atlántis || fíliam Călўpsónem
62. Ìgĭtur démŭm Ûlĭxí-cor || prae-pauóre fríxit

I transpose the MS text: *frixit prae pauore*, because a quadri-syllable of the form $-\cup-\underset{\smile}{}$ seems never to end a line (p. 168). *Ulixi-cor* is a strange word-group, and the double resolution in hem. I is irregular.

64. Útrum génu(a) amplóctens || uírginĕm oráret
65. Íbi mánens sedéto || dónicum uidébis
66. Mè carpénto uehénte || méam-domum uenísse
67. Símŭl ac dăcrŭmas dĕ-óre || noégeo detérsit

The irregularity of a double resolution in I suggests that the *ac* may be a dittography (MSS *simul ac lacrimas*). For *dĕ óre* cf. Plaut. Asin. 706 dĕ hórdeo (Klotz, Altröm. Metr., p. 139).

68. Námque núllum péius || mácerat humánum
69. Quámde máre saéuom || uís-et-cui sunt-mágnae

The echoing rhythm of these two lines favors *uis-et-cui* rather than *uis-et-cuì-sunt*.

71. Mèrcúrius cumqu(e)-éo || fílius Latónas
73. Nàm diuínă Monétas || fíliă me-dŏcŭit
75. Tópper fácit hómines || ut príŭs fűerunt
    Or *fuĕrunt*? Hardly *fŭĕrunt.* Cf. Kühner, Lat. Gram. I, p. 439.

Homónes ŭt-prius fuĕrunt would give the A-type to both hemistichs.

76. Tópper cítĭ ad-aédis || uénimus Círcae

Circäï will give 6 syllables to II and preserve the A-type pure. It is a perfectly justifiable alteration.

80. Sáncta púer, Satúrni || fíliă, regína

81. Éorum séctam sequóntur || múlti mórtales

The proper number of syllables in II is sacrificed for the sake of the alliteration.

82. Ùbi fóras cŭm-aúro || illíc exíbant

On *cŭm-auro* see Klotz, p. 139. *Ílico,* or *illĭc* (*exĭbat*) would give the normal A-type of II.

83. Múltĭ álĭ e-Tróia || strénui uíri

With 5-syllabled second hemistich. It would become 6-sylla- bled if we read *strenuosi.* So in Plaut. Trin. 1036 Löwe changed *strenuos* of the MSS to *strenuosos,* and saved the metre.

84. Iámqu(e) eĩūs-méntem fortúna || fécerat quiétem

85. Ínerant sígn(a) expréssa || quómodo Titáni

86. Bĭcórpores Gigántes || mágniqu(e) Atlántes

87. Rúncus àtque Porpŭrĕus, || fílii Térras
           Or *àtqu(e) Porpúreus.*

Terras is attested by Priscian, but cannot be said to be vindi- cated by the rhyme. *Terräï* would make the second hemistich normal.

89. Sìlvícolaĕ hómines || bellíqu(e) inértes
           Or *Sìluícolaĕ,* cf. *siluae,* a trisyllable, Hor. C. 1. 23. 4, Epod. 13. 2.

If we read *homónes,* then accentuate *bélliqu(e),* which is the normal accentuation. (See on v. 12.)

90. Blánd(e) et dócte percóntat || Aénĕam quo-pácto
           Tróiăm úrbem liquísset.

Blánd(e) et (or should *et* be removed from the text?) with elision of long vowel before a similar short vowel; cf. *magnopere. Quo-pacto* is a word-group like *quomodo. Reliquisset* could stand only if we admit the shortening of a naturally long vowel in a polysyllable by the 'breves brevians' law (see Engl. Journ. Phil. 1893).

91. Prím(a) incédit Céreris || Prosérpina púer

Alliteration with the first syllable of the second element of a prepositional compound, when that first syllable is accented, seems established for Plautus by the instances given in Buchhold, Parom., p. 47, e. g. Merc. 384 solus se in consilium seuocat, as

contrasted with Epid. 256 calidi conducibilis *consili*. It seems to occur in this line, in*c*édit Cereris, and possibly in v. 28 po*l*oúcta leibereis, and v. 15 glori(a) atqu(e) in*g*énium.

92. Déĩnde póllens sagíttis || ínclutus Arquítĕnens
93. Sánctŭs Délphis prognátus || Pýthius Apóllo
94. Ísque súsŭm ad-caélum || sústulit suás-res
96. Póstquăm áuĕm aspéxit || in-témplŏ Anchísa
Témpulo, for *in-témplo*, would give the A-type to II, like I.

97. Sácr(a) in-ménsa Penátĩum || órdinĕ ponúntur
Penátĩŭm would give a syllable too many to I, besides approximating awkwardly to the B-type. The alliteration between *Penatium* and *ponuntur* is probably not designed.

98. Ìmmolábat aúream || uíctimam púlcram
Aurátam would give the normal A-type to I. Or *hic uíctimam* or *piaculum* to II.

99. Símul àtrócia || porrícerent éxta
If we may give *atrocia* two accents. The rhyme favors this arrangement, but the defective number of syllables in I is suspicious. The true reading may have been *Simul <atque> atrocia.*

100. Tránsit Mélĩtam Románus, || ínsulăm intégram
101. Úrit, pŏpŭlátur, uástat || rĕm-hóstium concínnat
  Or *rĕm-hóstĩum*?
Some irregularities are condoned for the sake of the rhyme.

102. Uírum praétōr aduéneit, || aúspicat auspícĩum
103. Cénsent èo uentúrum || óbuiam Poénum
  Or *éo.*
105. Sùpérbiter contémtim || cónterit lĕgĩónes
106. Sèptimum-dĕcĩmŭm-ánnum || ílico sédent
  Priscian, de Fig. Num. 21, p. 413, 11 K., says of *septimus decimus* and similar compound numerals: sub uno accentu (i. e. main accent) proferuntur, so the main accent, if the word were not joined with *annus*, would fall on the first syllable of *decimus*. The change to *sederent* or *sedentes* would give the usual A-type to II, but I has not the usual A-type.

109. Sìcĩliénsis pacíscit || óbsides ut-réddant
110. Éĩ uénit in-méntem || hóminum fortúnas
111. Ònĕráriă onústae || stábant in-flústris
  Or *Ònerárĩăe.*
115. Rès-diuínas edícit, || praédicit cástus
The contrast between two compounds of the same verb would

divert the stress of the voice to the first syllable of *praedicit.* Cf.
Ter. Andr. 777 provólvam ... pérvolvam.

116. Sénex frĕtŭs pĭĕtáti || adlocútŭs súmmi
117. Régïs frátrem Neptúnum || regnatórem márum
118. Súmme déum regnátor || quiănam gĕnŭísti
119. Sésequ(e) ïi períre || máuolunt ibídem
120. Quàm cum-stúpro redíre || ád-suos pŏpŭláris

> Or *poplâris,* as Fleckeisen would read in Plaut. Rud. 740. Cf. Ποπ-
> λαρις (Arch. Ep. Mitth. I, p. 7).

The noun *stupro* would have some emphasis in pronunciation
here, so that the accentuation *cùm-stupro,* like *ób-viam,* is impossible.

121. Sín íllos déserant || fortíssimos uíros

> Or *Sïn,* or *illos.* On the defective number of syllables in the first
> hemistich, see the note on v. 1.

122. Mágnum stúprum pópulo || per-géntis fíeri

I transpose the MS reading in II, both to secure alliteration of
neighboring words and to give B-rhythm. But the true reading
may be *Romano,* the *populo* being a gloss. Then read *Románo* ||
fieri per-géntis, with A-rhythm in both hemistichs.

123. Nóctu Tróiad exíbant || căpïtibus opértis
124. Fléntes ámbaĕ, ăbĕúntes || lácrumis cum-múltis

> Or *âmbae,* in hiatus before the pause.

128. Férunt púlcras cratéras || aúreas lepístas
129. Mágnae métus tumúltus || péctoră possídit (-et)
130. Nóuem Ióuïs concórdes || fíliae soróres
131. Pátrem súum suprémum || óptumŭm appéllat

The alliteration gives a certain prominence to *suum,* and
prevents the accentuation *Patrém-suum.*

132. Scópas àtque uerbénas || ságmină sumpsérunt
133. Símul álïus ălïúnde || rúmitant intér-se

Inter sese of the MSS may stand, if we may scan *ïnter sése* (cf.
Plaut. Epid. 238; but see Thielmann in A. L. L. 7. 353), but
would give double 'resolution' in the same line. The close
connection of *alius* with *aliunde* favors the shortened form *alis*
(see Thielmann in A. L. L. 7. 373) (though Plautus has *álius
álium,* Stich. 370, Curc. 378; cf. Ter. Phorm. 333), which would
remove the double resolution from I.

135. Símul dŭön(a) eórum || pórtant ad-náuis
136. Mílli(a) áli(a) in-ísdem || ïnserinúntur

With 5-syllabled second hemistich echoing v. 135.

138. Dábunt málum Metélli || Naéuio poétae
139. Ímmortáles mortáles || si-forét-fas flére

Fas-est would naturally be a word-group like Greek χρῆ 'σται. I have given to the first syllable of *immortales* the mark of the main accent to indicate that the antithesis with *mortales* would throw on it more stress than usual. So in Plaut. Amph. prol. 36 the MS arrangement should be retained: Iusta aútem ab íniustís petere, etc. Cf. certa . . . íncerta út sient, Ter. Andr. 390.

140. Flérent díuae Caménae || Naéuium poétam
141. Ítăque póstquăm est Órcho || tráditŭs thesaúro
142. Obliti-sunt Romae loquier Latina lingua

Will not scan, as a genuine accentual Saturnian, for the second hemistich has three main accents. We may either suppose the line to be a late imitation of the obsolete metre, or we may change the reading, which depends on the sole authority of Gellius, into

<div style="text-align:center">Òblití-sunt Románe || lóquier Latíne</div>

or

<div style="text-align:center">Lóquier língua Latína || oblití-sunt Rómae.</div>

143. Súmmas ópes qui régum || régias refrégit
<div style="text-align:center">Or *Súmmas opés-qui*?</div>
144. Òccursátrix artíficum || pérdită spintúrnix

We are now in a position to discuss the fragmentary lines, and those lines in the list on pp. 144–156 whose text or metre is doubtful. To take the latter first:

57. <Aùt> in-Pýlum deuénïens || aut-íbï omméntans
The B-type of II does not suit the A-type of I. But the true accentuation may be *Aút . . . aút ibi*; cf. *ét . . . ét*, Ter. Andr. 536, etc.

58. Túncque rémos iússit || deligáre strúppis
The dissyllabic third foot is suspicious; but cf. 68–9.

63. Might conceivably scan as a Saturnian, thus:

<div style="text-align:center">Célsosqu(e) ócris ărŭăque || pútri(a) et mărĕ-mágnum</div>

but the alliterative word-group *mare magnum* is suspicious; also the double 'resolution' in the same line. For the accent of *aruáque* cf. Servius ad Aen. 3. 91 *limináque* (Class. Rev. V, p. 376). *Aruos* adj., Plaut. Truc. 1. 2. 47, is contrasted with *pascuōs*.

70. The simplest change would be *cònfríngerent*. But this would give B-type of I with A-type of II. So a dissyllable must

be added to I, e. g. *Tópper* <*córpus*> *confríngent*, unless we read *Tópper cònfringént-im* (cf. Paul. Fest. 73 Th. 'im' pro eum dicebant), which echoes the rhythm of the first hemistich of 69 and 68.

72. Néxerant múlt(a) intér-se || néxu nodórum

Or *nèxeránt-mult(a)*, with subordination of adverbial *multa* like that of adverbs of degree, e. g. 'much, very' in Old Teutonic poetry (Sievers in Paul's Grundriss, II, p. 874).

79. Cárnis aútem uinúmque || quod líbant anclátur

Anclabatur would be, perhaps, a unique instance of a quadri-syllable of the form — ◡ — ◡ at the end of the line. The further change to *quód-bibant* would give the line the normal A-form. An easier change, however, would be to make *quod libabant* (*libant*) a gloss, and allow 5-syllabled *ànculab-átur* to comprise in itself the second hemistich; cf. v. 136.

88. Márcus Vălĕrius cónsul || exérciti pártem

Will scan as a Saturnian, of a sort, by transposing the last two words.

95. Ămúlius <ac múltis> || gratulábat díuis

Suits the rhyme. Or transpose *diuis* and *gratulabatur*, which, however, would give us a line of 11 syllables instead of 13.

107. Íd quòque pacĭscúntur || moénia síquae

Gives a very doubtful Saturnian. *Ĭdēm-quoque paciscunt* (or *păcĭscúntur*) would give a better parallel to the rhythm of v. 108, but enclitic *quoque* is perhaps not justified by Plautine versifica-tion.   At the end of the line *suíque* or *sibíque* or *simúlque*, or any word of this form, would give the normal rhythm.

108. Lùtátium concĭlĭant || captíuos plúrimos

The usual rhythm would be given by *plurimos captiuos*, but the alliteration seems to require the MS order. *Reconciliant*, which would spoil the alliteration, would require two accents, if our law about 5-syllabled words is true, and so is inadmissible. A word like *plurimos* (— ◡ ◡) at the end of a line is unusual; so that the whole line is very doubtful.

113. Plèriqu(e)-ómnes sŭbĭgúntur || súb-tuum iudĭcĭum

The double resolution is suspicious. If we read *sub-únum* we should expect B-rhythm in I, e. g. *Plérosqu(e)-ómnes súbigunt* or *Plériqu(e)-ómnes súbeunt*. The verb *subeo* is rare in Old Latin (Langen, Beiträge, p. 218).

114. Púlcra <uás(a)> ex-aúro || uestémque citrósam

Either *citrosámque uéstem* or *uésteque citrósa* would give the suitable A-type of II.

125. Àtque priŭs páriet || lucústa lúcam.

Would scan, with reservation of *bouem* for next line. This gives B-type to both. A-type would be given by *paribit* || *lúcabos lucústam.* Cf. *luca bos*, Plaut. Cas. 4. 4. 20. For *paribit* see Kühner, Lat. Gram. I, p. 480, §179. 3; and for the spelling *lucusta* cf. Plaut. Men. 925.

126. Could be scanned as Saturnian lines of a sort by transposing *eunt* in the last line. *Fodantes* will rhyme with *sudantes*:

<div align="center">

conférre
Quéant rátĕm aerátam || quī per-líquidum
Éunt máre sudántes || àtque fodántes.

</div>

127. Cùm tu, déa, | arquĭtĕnens || ságĭttĭs póllens

If we allow the scansion *ságĭtta* in Plautus (see C. F. Müller, Plaut. Pros., p. 253). Perhaps *sagittipollens* should be read like *vinipollens*, Plaut. Curc. 114.

134. Àpŭd-empŏrĭŭm in-cámpo || hóstium pro-móene

The double resolution in I would be avoided by trisyllabic *emporĭûm.*

137. Rédĕunt réfĕrunt petíta || rumóre secúndo

Would make a bad Saturnian with double resolution in I, and unsuitable B-type in II. Besides, the alliteration favors the transposition *rumore petita.*

I now take the fragmentary lines ascribed to Livius Andronicus and Naevius, in the order in which they are given in Havet, De Saturnio Versu, pp. 425 sqq.

A. *From Livius Andronicus.*

145. Páter nóster Satúrni || fílie xx′x
> Quoted by Prisc. I, p. 305 H., for *filie*, voc. sg.

146. Quaĕ haec dáps-est? qui-féstus || xxx′x díes?
> Quoted by Prisc. I, p. 321, for *daps*. Translates Hom. Od. 1. 225, and possibly follows immediately on v. 54, above. For the accentuation *quaé haec . . . est* cf. the scansion, invariable in Plautus, *quís hic homóst* (Seyff. in Berl. Phil. Woch. 1891, p. 108).

147. x̆x̆ Atqu(e) éscas habémus || mentiónem x′x
> Quoted by Prisc. I, p. 198, for *escas*, gen. sg. One MS has *mentionem habemus.*

Or *Átqu(e) éscas habeámus,* if *Atque* 'thereupon' is meant as a translation of ἐξαῦτις, Od. 4. 213 δόρπου δ' ἐξαῦτις μνησώμεθα.

148. Iám in-áltŭm expúlsa ‖ líntre . . .

    Quoted by Prisc. I, p. 151, for *linter,* fem.

[149. sic quoque fitum est]

    Ap. Non. s. v. *fite,* 475 M.

  Looks more like the ending of a dactylic hexameter than anything else.

150. . . . parcéntes ‖ praémodum . . .

    Ap. Gell. 6. 7. 11, who quotes the words as an instance of *praemodum* used for *admodum,* and adds: in quo scilicet prima syllaba acui debet.

[151. affatim edi, bibi, lusi]

    Ap. Paul. Fest. 8 Th. Not assigned to the Odyssea, and so quite possibly from a drama. On the accentuation of *affatim* see Gell. 6. 7.

152. x′x quŏnĭăm audíui ‖ paúcis gauísi

    Quoted by Prisc. I, p. 482, for *gavisi.* One MS has *audiuit,* so Reichardt proposes *audiui it* (later *id*; cf. Neue, II^3, p. 375). With that reading I should prefer *aúdii,* to give the B-type to the line.

[153. <Uacerra> corde et malefica uecordia]

    Ap. Fest. 570 Th., s. v. *vacerra.* An iambic senarius.

154. Uéstĭs púlla purpŭrĕa ‖ xxx′x ámpla

    Ap. Non. 368 M., s. v. *pullus.* Probably from Livius.

[155. dusmo in loco]

    Ap. Paul. Fest., p. 47 Th.

156. Dèque-mănĭbus dextrábus ‖ . . .

    Ap. Non. 493 M., s. v. *dextrabus.*

B. *From Naevius.*

157. Éam cárnem x′xx ‖ uictóribus dánunt

    Ap. Non. 97 M., s. v. *danunt.*

158. Vĭcissátim vólvie*r* ‖ victóriam x′x

    Ap. Non. 183 M., s. v. *vicissatim.* MSS *volvi.*

159. Fámes ácer augéscit ‖ hóstibus xx′x

    Quoted by Prisc. I, p. 153, for *acer,* fem.

160. x′x x′x quod brúti ‖ néc-satis sardáre
Queunt.

    Ap. Fest. 472 Th.; Paul. Fest. 473 Th.; Varro, L. L. 7. 107. Were the missing words *Díctus Brútus*? Here *nec* is the same particle as in *neglegens, necullus,* etc. The alliteration may require *nec-sátis.*

161. <Tópper> saéui capésset ‖ flámmam Uolcáni

    Ap. Fest. 532 Th., s. v. *topper.* MS *sic C. Naevicapesset,* etc. Reichardt omits *saevi,* a very doubtful word. The normal form of II would

be given by *fldmm(a) eum.* Notice that the regularity of I is not disturbed for the sake of the rhyme by putting *saeui* last.

The solitary line which we possess of the *Carmen Priami* (?):

[162. [ueteres] Casmenas cascam rem uolo profari*er*]

> Ap. Varr. L. L. 7. 28, who explains *cascus* by *vetus.* Spengel brackets *ueteres* as a gloss. MS *profari et.* The line is to all appearance an iambic senarius. It might scan as a Saturnian, thus:

> x′x cáscam Casménas ‖ rém uolo profárei.

Havet attributes to the same poem a line quoted by Marius Victorinus (VI 138 K.) in his account of Saturnian metre:

[163. cum uictor Lemno classem Doricam appulisset,]

which looks suspiciously like a late quantitative imitation of the old accentual Saturnian. The line just quoted will scan in the same quantitative fashion (as an iambic dimeter catalectic followed by a trochaic tripody), if we do not bracket *ueteres*:

> ueterés Casmenas cáscam ‖ rém uolo profárei.

Of the early hymns, proverbs, etc., mentioned by Havet, only a few could possibly be claimed for the Saturnian metre. The line of the *Carmen Saliare* ap. Ter. Scaur. 28, 6 K. (MSS cuine ponas Leucesiae praetexere monti), quoted for *cume*, the old form of *cum*, seems rather to have only two accents in each hemistich:

[164. cúme-tonas, Leucésie, ‖ praí-ted tremónti,]

(if anything can be stated about a text so doubtful), like the line (?) quoted by Varro, L. L. 7. 26:

> dúonus Cérus-es ‖ dúonus Ianúsque.

A charm mentioned by Varro, R. R. 1. 2. 27, runs:

165. Térra péstem tenéto ‖ sálus hic-manéto,

where *Pestem Terra teneto* would be the order usually required by alliteration, and *hic-manéto sálus* the more regular form of the second hemistich, a form which might be sacrificed here for the sake of the rhyme.

We have now nothing remaining but the most difficult part of our task, the examination of the Saturnian lines embedded in prose passages of Livy. I follow still the order of Havet.

The oracle in Livy 5. 16. 8 seems to contain echoes of Saturnian lines, possibly of some form like this:

166. Áquăm-Albánam, Románe, ‖ cauĕ lácu tenéri,
   Livy: Romane, aquam Albanam . . . contineri.
   Or: Áquăm Albánam cauéto ‖ continéri lácu.

167. Cáuĕ in-máre manáre ‖ suō-flúmine sínas.
   Mare will have the stress, probably. A better rhythm would be given by *suō-fluénto.*

168. Míssam pĕr-ăgros rigábis, ‖ dissipátam ríuis
   Livy: emissam . . . dissipatamque rivis extingues.

169. Túm tŭ aúdax insíste ‖ hóstium múris
   Livy: insiste audax.

170. Mémor quàm per-tot-ánnos ‖ óbsides úrbem
   The remaining half of the passage is even more doubtful.

The first oracle of Marcius in Livy 25. 12 seems to be in dactylic hexameters; but the second, which is also paraphrased by Macrobius 1. 17. 28, may be broken up into tentative Saturnians:

171. Pèrduéllis, Románi ‖ péllere si-ex-ăgro
   Livy and Macr.: Hostem(-is), Romani, si (exagro) expellere vultis, which reads like a dactylic hexameter.

172. Uóltis uŏmĭcam quae géntĭŭm ‖ *grassátur* lónge

173. Àpóllini uouéndos ‖ cénseo lúdos

174. Quì quotánnis cómiter ‖ Apóllini fíant

175. Cùm-déderit (? Quándo dĕdĕrit) pópulus ‖ ex-público pártem
   Liv. Macr.: Cum populus dederit.

176. Príuĭ ùti-cónferant ‖ pro-séd atque súis
   Liv. Macr.: Privati(s) uti. For *privi* cf. Paul. Fest., p. 282, 22 Th.; Plaut. Pseud. 865.

177. Ìis lúdis făcĭúndis ‖ praéerit is-praétor

178. Iús-qui pŏpŭlo plebeíque ‖ xxxʹx súmmum
                              (iudicábit ?)
   Liv. Macr.: Qui jus . . . dabit summum.

179. Dècémuiri Graecátim ‖ hóstiis rem-făcĭant
   Liv. Macr.: graeco ritu hostiis sacra faciant.

180. Hóc-si récte făcĭétis ‖ gaudébitis sémper
                  (? fáxitis)

? 181. Fíet mĕlĭor res-uóstra ‖ năm-is-díuos exstínguet
   Liv. Macr.: fiet que res (publica) (vestra) melior nam is divus extinguet (-it).

182. Uóstros cámpos qui plăcĭde ‖ perduéllis páscunt
   Liv. Macr.: Perduellis vestros qui vestros campos pascunt (-it) placide.

From the dedicatory tablet in Liv. 40. 52. 4 we have already quoted the first line:

Dŭello mágno dĭrĭméndo, ‖ régibus sŭbĭgéndis.

Another seems to be:

183. Uícta, fúsa, contúsa ‖ et fugáta fúit.
Liv. *fugataque est* (see Neue Formenl. II², p. 355).

The two last possibly:

184. Éa púgna pugnáta ‖ Antĭŏchus regnúmque
(réx-fŭit ?)
Liv. *rex Antiochus.*

185. Eĭŭs-r(ei)-erg(o) aédem Láribus ‖ permarínis uóuit

With the accentuation of the opening words of v. 185 cf. *eĭ-r(ei)-operám-dare*, the invariable ictus in Plautus' verses (Seyffert, Stud. Plaut., p. 25, *n*).

A few of the lines unearthed from Livy's prose go smoothly enough, such as v. 174, but most of the others lack the true ring of Saturnians. Jingling prophecies, however, are not to be expected to show correct rhythm, and we might cap these halting Saturnians with equally bad hexameters from the *Sortes* in C. I. L. I 1438 sqq., e. g.

I 1438　conrigi uix tandem quod curuom est factum crede.
I 1448　laetus lubens petito [quod] dabitur gaudebis semper,

or from the dactylic Carmen Marcianum (Liv. 25. 12. 2), of which the last line seems to be

ĭs fuăt esca caro tua; nam mi[hi] ita Iuppitĕr fatust.

Festus quotes a line from another prophecy of the same Marcius which seems to be a Saturnian:

186. Quámuis nòuéntium ‖ dŭŏnum nĕgŭmáte
Ap. Fest. 164 Th., s. v. *negumate.*

but both the words and the accentuation are in the highest degree doubtful. The 4-syllabled *nouéntium* is uncertain; the alliteration would require *negumate duonum*, and so on.

A fragment from another exists both in Festus and his epitomator Paulus Diaconus:

187. Nè níngulus medéri ‖ xxx′x quéat
Ap. Fest. 188 Th.; Paul. 189 Th.

Whether Festus' quotation from the Sententiae Appii is in this metre is doubtful:

188. Néquid fraúdis stupríque ‖ ferócia páriat
   Ap. Fest. 460 Th., s. v. *stuprum*. MS *pareat*.

Perhaps *paret*. The line is preceded by the words *qui animi compotem esse*, which Havet tries to fit into a Saturnian line.

Another old proverb preserved by Festus reads more like a trochaic tetrameter:

 Quasi messor per messĭm unumquemque spicum colligit,
   Ap. Fest. 492 Th., s. v. *spicus*.

and the same may be said of a quotation of Priscian (8. 18) from the Sententiae Appii, which is difficult to scan in any metre: Amicum cum uides obliviscere miserias. Inimicus si es (? sies) commentus [nec libens aeque]. The last three words are omitted by all but one MS. *Commentus* is glossed by σεσοφισμένος:

    &#x2248; amicum cum uides obliuiscēre miserias;
    Inimicis sĭ es commentus, nec-libens aeque <face>.

§6. Development of Saturnian from Indo-European Metre.—A Suggestion.

A detailed comparison of the Saturnian metre with the metre of other Indo-European nations, and a full account of its historical development from the original Indo-European metre, lie outside of the province of this article. My only aim has been to detect the laws which governed Livius and Naevius in framing their lines, not the laws which were observed by their remote predecessors. To determine these earlier laws it would first be necessary to determine the scheme of that primitive Indo-European metre, which seems to have been the parent, not only of the Latin accentual Saturnian, but also of the syllabic metre of the Avesta, of the syllabic (partly quantitative) metre of the Vedas, of the Teutonic alliterative verse, and perhaps even of the Greek hexameter (see Allen in Kuhn's Zeitschr. 1879, p. 559; Westphal, Allgem. Metrik). And this, I believe, cannot be rightly done until we have received from specialists a reliable account of all the native metres of Indo-European peoples. The Celtic metres especially may be expected to throw light on the prehistoric Italic metre, but of these at present hardly anything has been

ascertained.[1] The two metres which have been most fully studied, the Early Indian (see Oldenberg, Hymnen des Rig-Veda, Berl. 1888) and the Early Teutonic (see Sievers, Altgerm. Metrik, Leipz. 1892), suggest a few considerations about the history of the Latin Saturnian, which may be worth mentioning in lieu of a more ambitious treatment.

The Gâyatrî pâda of the Vedas, apparently the best representative of that primitive metre from which the Saturnian hemistich was derived, consists of eight syllables, of which the first four may be of any quantity, the last four are normally $\cup - \cup \overset{\cup}{-}$, e. g.

> Agnim îlê pŭrōhĭtăm
> yajñasya devăm r̥̄tvĭjăm
> hôtâram ratnădhātămăm

This regard for quantity at the end, though not at the beginning of the line, suggests the possibility of combining the quantitative and accentual schemes of Saturnian metre. According to such a combined scheme, the first two feet would show no regard for quantity, e. g. *dăbŭnt mălŭm* or *Rūncŭs ātquĕ*, but the end of the hemistich would be quantitative, and would be properly expressed $\overset{\cup}{-} - \overset{\cup}{-}$, e. g. *Mĕtēllī*. Instead of the normal A-type, given above (p. 311), viz. x'x x'x xx'x, we should have to substitute

$$x'x \; x'x \; \overset{\cup}{-} \perp \overset{\cup}{-}.$$

Such a scheme would undoubtedly suit every hemistich of the normal A-type, e. g.

> Dábunt málum Mĕtēllī
> Fúndit fúgat prōstērnĭt
> Uírum míhi Cămēnă.

For all that, I do not believe that it is the scheme which was present to the mind of Livius and Naevius. By the law of Latin

[1] Prof. Thurneysen has furnished strong grounds for believing that the metre of the Old Irish hymns, etc., is not the native Irish metre (which must be sought elsewhere), but an imitation of the late Latin ecclesiastical metres. So that the comparison of Latin Saturnians with, let us say, the opening line of the hymn to St. Patrick is, however tempting, quite useless:

> Dabunt malum Metelli ‖ Naeuio poetae
> ‖ cosentiont Romai
> Génair Pátraicc in Némthur ‖ is éd atfét hi scélaib.

I fancy that it will be found that the Celtic nations took rhyme (or rather assonance) for the leading feature of their poetry, as the Teutonic nations took alliteration.

accentuation which prevailed in their time, as well as after them, the penultimate syllable of a word, if long, was accented; and so, in ninety-nine out of every hundred lines, a hemistich with accented penultima will naturally have a long penultima. But that this apparent observance of quantity is merely the result of an actual observance of accent is shown by two things: first, by the rule of Saturnian metre that the first syllable of the line must be an accented syllable (a rule which indicates the accentual nature of the metre); and second, by that principle of alternation of accentual rhythm which we have found to underlie Saturnian versification. That principle, however, could plainly not have existed in the earlier period, when the accent attached itself to the first syllable of every word; and its existence in the literary period is no proof that quantity had not at an earlier time played any part in the metre. That quantity alone, or accent alone, or quantity and accent combined, supplied the rhythm to the earlier Saturnians—all these are hypotheses which it is equally impossible to affirm or to deny with certainty. There is another possibility, that neither quantity nor accent, but merely the counting of syllables, was the sole or leading rhythmical factor until the change from the old monotony of accentuation brought with it the possibility of a new rhythmical effect, the alternation of accentual rhythm, of the 'falling' with the 'rising' accentuation. That this alternation, which seems to be the rhythmical factor with Livius and Naevius, was the direct outcome of the change from the old to the new accent law is probable enough in itself, and has analogies in the history of the development of Teutonic metre.

Prof. Sievers, who claims five types for the Early Teutonic alliterative verse, the most frequent type being x'x x'x, e. g. *hyran scolde,* gives a most ingenious account of how these five may have been evolved at different stages by gradual development from a primitive type like that of the Gâyatrî pâda. We may here, for the sake of simplicity, confine ourselves to the most frequent type, just mentioned, viz. x'x x'x.

The primitive metre he makes xx' xx' xx' xx' (cf. the Gâyatrî pâda of the Vedas), or, admitting secondary as well as main accents, xx' xx' xx' xx'. How would this type be changed by the working of the phonetic laws of the Teutonic languages themselves? In the first place, the Teutonic accent (like the Latin accent) shifted, at an early period, to the first syllable of each

word. The result of this change of pronunciation on the metre would be that this verse-type would lose its first syllable and become x′x x‵x x′xx‵. Next, the operation of those stringent laws of syncope of the unaccented vowel which transformed the whole aspect of the Teutonic vocabulary would efface the unaccented syllables and reduce the line, to x′x‵ x′x‵. From this to the normal type x′x x′x is but a step, and this step, the reduction of a syllable with secondary accent to the position of an unaccented syllable, Prof. Sievers explains as a result of the change from the use of the metre for song to its use for recitation.

All this suggests that the Latin Saturnian may have passed through somewhat similar stages. If we suppose as starting-point a type like xx′ xx′ xx′ xx′, the shifting of the accent to the first syllable of each word would produce the new type x′x, x′x, x′x x, e. g. (1) *hónce oino ploírume*, or (I use the early accentuation) *dábunt málum Mételli.* Or else, supposing the second accent to be subordinate, x′xx‵x, x′xx, e. g. (2) *dùonòro óptumo*, or *grátulàbat diuiti*, or *immolàbat aúratam.* Or with still further subordination of the second accent, e. g. (3) *Naéuio póetae.* A new type might be evolved by the occasional suppression, through syncope, of a syllable following the accent, x′xx‵x, x′x, e. g. (4) *grátulàbat díti.* Similarly *cósèntiont Római* and *fúisse uirum.* When, at a later time, the penultima law of accentuation came in, No. 1 would remain, e. g. *hónce oino ploírume*, or would become x′x, x′x, xx′x, e. g. (5) *dábunt málum Metélli*; No. 2 would be slightly changed to ‵x′xx′x, x′xx, e. g. *dùonóro optumo*, or would become x‵xx′x, xx′x, e. g. (6) *ìmmolábat aurátam*; No. 3 would become x′xx, xx′x, e. g. (7) *Naéuio poétae*; No. 4 would remain, with slight change, x‵xx′x, x′x, e. g. *gràtulábat díti, cósèntiont Római*, or would become xx′x, x′x, e. g. (8) *fuisse uírum.* The difference between 'falling' and 'rising' accentuation, according to the new penultima law, was seized on as a means of eliciting rhythmical effect, just as the Teutonic race selected alliteration for the same purpose; and certain of these types were reserved for one or other hemistich, with the object of securing, as far as possible, this alternation of accentual rhythm for the whole line. Thus a first hemistich of type No. 5, our 'normal A-type,' e. g. *Dábunt málum Metélli*, which ended with 'rising' accentuation, would take as second hemistich the type numbered 7, e. g. *Naéuio poétae*, which began with 'falling' and ended with 'rising' accentuation. This was preferred to the other similar type, No. 3, e. g.

gràtulábat dǐti, because the shortened type of hemistich (6 syllables) had come to be appropriated for the second hemistich, and, since this type had often only two accents, this number of accents came to be regarded as the fitting number for this part of the line.   A hemistich of the form *gràtulábat dǐti,* which contained the possibility of a third accent, namely, the secondary accent on the first syllable, was therefore deemed not so suitable.   A less favored type of the first hemistich, less favored because it did not give alternation of accentual rhythm, was that of No. 1 *hónce oíno ploírume,* or No. 2 *dùonóro óptumo,* which maintained the 'falling' accentuation throughout the hemistich.   To it was naturally joined a second hemistich beginning with a 'rising' accentuation, such as No. 4 *coséntiont Római,* or No. 8 *fuísse uírum.*

Such may have been the development of the types which we find in use at the time of Livius Andronicus and Naevius:

the A-type   x′x$_{(,)}$ x′x, xx′x ‖ x′xx, xx′x
                                      (xxx′x, x′x)

e. g.   Dábunt málum Metélli ‖ Naévio poétae
                                      (adlocútus súmmi)

and the rarer B-type x′x$_{(,)}$ x′x, x′xx ‖ xx′xx, x′x
                                      (xx′x, x′x)

e. g.   Prím(a)-incédit Céreris ‖ Prosérpina púer
                                      (fuísse uírum).

[NOTE.—Two Pelignian inscriptions (Zvetaieff, Inscr. Ital. Inf. Dial. 13–14.   See for 13, also Pauli, Altital. Stud. V) seem, from their alliterative language, to be metrical:

            . . . .
No. 13.   ... pracom . . . . . .
            usur pristafalacirix prismu petie*d*u ip ui*d*adụ
            uib*d*u omnitu uranias ecuc empratois
            çlisuist cerfum sacaracirix semunu suad
            aetatu firata fertlid praicime perseponas
            af*d*ed.   eite uus pritrome pacris puus ecic
            lexe.   lifar dida uus deti hanustu herentas

No. 14.   pes pros ecuf incubat
            casnar oisa aetate
            c anaes solois des forte
                    faber

I would render them in Peligno-Latin:

No. 13. ... uxor(ĕ)s praestabulatric(ĕ)s, Prima Pet(t)ie*dy*a ib(i) vi*y*am-do, Vīb(e)*dy*a Omnīta Uranias ec(c)uc imperatis vectast, Cerforum sacratrix Sēmōnum ; suā aetate finitā (?) fertili, regnum-in Proserpinae ab(i)*y*it. Ite vos praeterum-in pācres qui ec(c)idc(e) lexte. Libar (i. e. affluentiam ?) det vobis dei(ve)te (acc. sg. neut.) honesta Herentas : i. e. ... priestesses, Pettiedia Prima there to the roadside (*sc.* was carried for burial), Vibidia Omnīta by the commands of Urania was carried hither, the priestess of the Cerfi Semones ; her fruitful life ended, she departed to the realm of Proserpine. Go on in peace (or good-will), you who have read this. May beauteous Venus give you rich abundance.

No. 14. ped(ĕ)s p(a)ros (?) ec(c)ub(i) incubat cānār(is), usā aetate, Kaeso Annaeus, sollis dei(ve)s, Forte faber: i. e. a few feet (?) (*sc.* of ground) here an old man lies upon, his life completed, Kaeso Annaeus, enriched with all things, fostered (favored) by Fortune. (For a detailed discussion of these inscriptions see my article in the Classical Review, March, 1893.)

I would arrange them in Saturnian lines as follows:

No. 13. úsur prìstafalác(i)rix, ‖ Prísmu Petié*d*u
 íp ui*d*ádu, Uíb*d*u ‖ Omnítu Uránïas
ècuc emprátois clísūĭst, Cérfum ‖ săcărác(i)rix Semúnu ;
> Or *ĕcŭc*, giving 8 full sylls. to hem. I.

sūad-aetátu firáta fértlid, ‖ praicíme Persépŏnas
> Or *fĭrăta* (? *f(i)rāta*), giving 8 full sylls. to hem. I.

áf*d*ed. Eít(e)-uus prítrom-e ‖ pácris, puus écic
léxe. Lífar didá-uus ‖ déti hanúst(u) Heréntas
> Or *dĕt(i)-hanúst(u) Heréntas* 'loaded with riches.' Or *dĭdă-uus-dĕt(i) ‖ hanúst(u) Heréntas*, echoing the rhythm of the preceding line. For *eit(e)* cf. Plaut. Poen. 1237 *it(e)*.

No. 14. pés-pros écuf íncubat ‖ cásnar oís(a) aetáte,
> Or *oìs(a)-aetáte.* Or *incúbat*, if there is alliteration with *casnar*.

Caéso Anáes, sólois ‖ dés, Fórte fáber
> Or *soloís- ‖ -des.*

The accentuation of the Pelignian language is, with the meagre evidence at our disposal, quite uncertain. I suppose it to follow the penultima law ; while another theory makes the first syllable of each word accented. But leaving the accentuation aside as too doubtful for argument, we may perhaps see in the lines a

regard for the numbering of syllables, the normal amount being 7 for hem. I, 6 for hem. II. There appears also to be correspondence of rhythm between adjacent lines, e. g. vv. 3–4 of No. 13 with extra-long first hemistich. And alliteration plays a leading part in the metre, whereas rhyme is found only once, in No. 13, v. 3. So that, if the accentuation of Latin Saturnian verse is not reproduced in the Pelignian lines, they retain at least the characteristics of what I have mentioned as a possible earlier stage of the Latin metre, viz. counting of syllables, arrangement in distichs (or, at any rate, correspondence of rhythm between adjacent lines), and alliteration. They are interesting, because they are apparently the only examples preserved to us of dialectal Saturnians. The Marsic inscription (Zvet. No. 45), which I would read : Caso Cantovios Aprufclano ceip. apur finem Esalicom enurbid Casontoni socieque donom atolero Actia. Pro l[ecio]nibus Martses, has only slight alliteration, which can hardly be designed (unless in atolero Actia = *attulere Angitiae*), and is quite unlikely to be metrical. And the Oscan inscription in Greek characters (Zvet. No. 232) seems to be a very prosaic notice about the ownership of a burying-place. I read : πωτ ϜολλοϜωμ σοροϜωμ εινκαπιδιτωμ Καϝας λεικειτ κωαχερηι λιοκακειτ σϜα[ι] . . . εσοτ βρατωμ μειαι ανα- (some verb; cf. ανασακετ, No. 247), and render in Osco-Latin : quod volvum ('round' or 'walled round'; cf. Lat. *vulva*, and perhaps Ir. *falbach* 'rampart' = I.-Eur. **wolwāco-*) sorvum incapidītum Gavas (cf. *Gava*, C. I. L. I 1097) licitus est coegre (meaning *cum agro*; cf. *peregre*) . . . suae . . . id bratum meae (donavit).

In the last number of Gröber's Grundriss der romanischen Philologie, Professor Stengel derives the ordinary hendecasyllable of the Romance languages from the Latin Saturnian. Could his theory be established, the Saturnian metre would indeed be able to boast of a long existence. But a grave objection seems to me the absence of the metre from the epitaphs of the poor in the Imperial Age. The Iambic Senarius and Trochaic Septenarius appear to have been the popular metres of the Empire, not the Saturnian.]

JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD, ENGLAND.   W. M. LINDSAY.

III.—A COLLATION OF THE OLD ARMENIAN VERSION OF PLATO'S LAWS, BOOK IV.[1]

In the remaining books (IV–XII) of the Laws it will not be necessary to point out in detail the many points of identity between the text of the great Paris MS and that of the Armenian translator. In our examination of books I–III we have shown that the Armenian adheres to the text of the Paris Codex 1807 in almost all cases where other MSS, really apographs of it, show deviations. When the Armenian really departs from the Paris text, it is often but to agree with other genuinely independent and old sources, such as Ficino's Latin rendering or the citations of Eusebius and Stobaeus.

In book IV of the Laws the following passages may be noticed. Where the Armenian seems to yield a sound reading I have prefixed an asterisk. The collation is with the text of Schanz all through.

St. 704 B, Sch. 98. 8 πόλις, ἧς πέρι τὰ νυνδὴ λεχθέντα ἡμῖν. The Arm. implies τὰ νῦν διαλεχθέντα. Cp. Theat. 158 C ἅ τε γὰρ νυνὶ διειλέγμεθα. But the received text is satisfactory, and all that can be here said of the Armenian reading is that it is equally satisfactory.

*St. 704 B, Sch. 98. 10. Schanz reads: τί δέ; λιμένες ἆρ' εἰσὶν κατὰ ταῦτα αὐτῆς, ἢ τὸ παράπαν ἀλίμενος; This is the reading of the Paris MS. Eusebius, in citing the passage, has εἰσὶν κατ' αὐτῆς, ἢ κ. τ. λ., which is also implied by the Arm. Ficino renders: "Portus uero suntne prope? An mare illud penitus importuosum"; which agrees better with the reading of Eusebius than with that of the Paris MS.

*St. 704 B, Sch. 98. 12. Sch. reads with the Paris MS: Εὐλίμενος μὲν οὖν ταύτῃ γε ὡς δυνατόν, and does not notice the variant οὖν αὕτη given in Eusebius and, furthermore, implied by the Armenian. The agreement throughout this passage of the Armenian with Eusebius' citation is important, for it proves (1) that these variants are not due to citation, but were in the text itself which Eusebius had, and (2) that a genuinely old text underlies the Armenian.

[1] See A. J. P. XII 193–210.

St. 704 C, Sch. 98. 15, 16.   Perhaps the translator read ἐπιδεήσει for ἐπιδεής in both sentences.

*St. 704 C, Sch. 98. 21.   The Version adds πάσης, so as to read : τί δέ; πεδίων τε καὶ ὀρῶν καὶ ὕλης πάσης πῶς μέρος ἑκάστων ἡμῖν εἴληχεν; The sense would be "wood of all sorts."   As introductory to the exception he means to make of ship-building wood, Plato may well have written πάσης here ; and the fact of πῶς following after it may explain its absence from the Paris MS.

St. 704 D, Sch. 98. 25 πάνυ μὲν οὖν].   The Version adds ἑκάτερα, which seems the addition of one who missed the sense of the passage.

*St. 704 D, Sch. 98. 29 μεγάλου τινὸς ἔδει σωτῆρός τε αὐτῇ.   The Arm. has αὐτῇ, which Ficino also implies : "maximo sibi salutis fundatore opus esset."

St. 704 D, Sch. 99. 3.   The Arm. translator renders as if σχεδὸν came after δέοντος.   Perhaps, however, he merely read the comma after, instead of before, σχεδόν.

*St. 705 A, Sch. 99. 4, 5 πρόσοικος γὰρ θάλαττα χώρᾳ τὸ μὲν παρ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἡδύ.   This is the reading of the Paris MS.   Stobaeus, in citing the passage, reads θαλάττῃ χώρα, which is also involved by the Armenian.   Schanz omits to notice this variant, which has at least as much authority as that of the Paris MS.

*St. 705 A, Sch. 99. 7 ἐμπιμπλᾶσα αὐτήν.   The Version has αὐτήν, which is also read in early editions of Stobaeus, and must be accepted, if just before θαλάττῃ χώρα be read.

*St. 705 B, Sch. 99. 12 τραχεῖα δὲ οὖσα δῆλον ὡς οὐκ ἂν πολύφορος ἅμα.   Schanz notes that πάμφορος is read in the Paris MS, but that the letters ἁμ are written over an erasure of πολύφορος, while a manus recentior adds before πάμφορος and outside the line the words πολύφορος τε εἴη καὶ.   Eusebius has πολύφορός τ' εἴη καὶ πάμφορος, which Stobaeus also gives, only reading τις for τ'.   The Armenian, like Eusebius, adds καὶ παμφ., but omits εἴη and favors γε instead of τ'.   Ficino also had the reading of Eusebius, and well brings out its meaning : "Cumque silvosa sit et aspera, licet omnia ferat, non tamen abunde omnia."   The reading of Schanz comes to the same thing, but the weight of the evidence is in favor of adding the words καὶ πάμφορος.

St. 705 B, Sch. 99. 19 συγχωροῦμεν τότε λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὀρθῶς καὶ τὰ νῦν. The Arm. involves ὑμᾶς, which Ficino perhaps read, for he renders : "et illa tunc, et nunc *ista* recte dicta concedimus."

*St. 705 D, Sch. 100. 5.   Schanz reads : τὸ δὲ ὅτι πρὸς μέρος ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς πᾶσαν σχεδόν, οὐ πάνυ ξυνεχώρουν.   The Arm. places the

comma before, not after, σχεδόν, with a gain to the sense. Ficino
renders: "quoniam vero non ad universam, sed ad virtutis partem
ferme equidem non valde laudabam," which perhaps points to
similar punctuation in his Greek. Stephanus takes it in the same
way.

*St. 706 A, Sch. 100. 8–11. Schanz reads: τοῦτον γὰρ δὴ τίθεσθαι
τὸν νόμον ὀρθῶς ὑποτίθεμαι μόνον, ὃς ἂν δίκην τοξότου ἑκάστοτε στοχάζηται
τούτου ὅτῳ ἂν συνεχῶς τῶν ἀεὶ καλῶν τι ξυνέπηται μόνον, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ξύμπαντα
παραλείπῃ. In this passage the Paris MS reads τοῦ τῶν after συνεχῶς
and μόνωι (sic), μόνον being written in margin in late hand. The
Armenian confirms Schanz in omitting τοῦ after συνεχῶς, and also
omits μόνον, which Ficino also omits: "qui veluti sagittarius illuc
animum semper intendit, unde continuo aliquid semperque sequa-
tur eorum quae bona sunt."

St. 706 A, Sch. 100. 12 ἐάν τε ἄρα τι τῶν ἄλλων. Here the Version
has ἄλλο instead of ἄρα.

St. 706 C, Sch. 100. 25. The Version unaccountably omits
μονίμων after ὁπλιτῶν in l. 25, and μένοντας just below after ἀποθνήσκειν.
The double omission has a purposive air. But μονίμων has not
only the authority of the Paris Codex and of Ficino, but of
Plutarch as well (vit. Philopoem., p. 363 F). It is to be remarked
that Stephanus read νομίμων from some bad MS.

St. 707 A, Sch. 101. 19. Schanz reads: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις αἱ διὰ τὰ
ναυτικὰ πόλεων δυνάμεις ἅμα σωτηρίας τιμὰς οὐ τῷ καλλίστῳ τῶν πολεμικῶν
ἀποδιδόασιν. διὰ κυβερνητικῆς γὰρ καὶ πεντηκονταρχίας καὶ ἐρετικῆς [καὶ]
παντοδαπῶν καὶ οὐ πάνυ σπουδαίων ἀνθρώπων γιγνομένης, τὰς τιμὰς ἑκάστοις
οὐκ ἂν δύναιτο ὀρθῶς ἀποδιδόναι τις.

In the above the Paris Codex has ἐρετρικῆς and ἅμα σωτηρίᾳ.
Badham conjectured σωτηρίας. Ast would remove διὰ before
κυβερνητικῆς. Schanz brackets καὶ before παντοδαπῶν, and the apo-
grapha omit it. Ast conjectured διὰ παντοδαπῶν. The Armenian
does little to remove the difficulties of the passage. It gives the
following sense: "Praeterea et civitatum quae per navalia et vires
simul salutis, et honores non optimae parti rerum bellicarum
retribuerunt. Et enim per artem gubernatoriam, L virorum
principatu, et principatu variorum quae (or ? qui) est hominum
et non specialiter optimorum, honores singulis non possit quispiam
retribuere recte." From which it appears that the Armenian
read *ἀρχικῆς or ἡγεμονικῆς instead of ἐρετικῆς, and, with the
apographa, omitted καὶ before παντοδαπῶν. It is also almost certain
that the Armenian translator read καὶ after σωτηρίας. He seems to

have understood the whole passage as follows: "Moreover, of cities, those which depend on fleets apportion the forces of safety, as well as the honors, not to the best of the warlike elements," etc.

St. 708 D, Sch. 102. 7 οὐ τὸ σῴζεσθαί τε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι μόνον ἀνθρώποις τιμιώτατον ἡγούμενοι. The Arm. renders in the sense τὸ οὕτω σῴζεσθαι καὶ οὐ τὸ εἶναι μόνον κ. τ. λ. It is more probable that this is an ingenious misreading of the text we have, than that the Armenian actually found the above reading in his MS. οὕτω, of course, meant 'by means of political virtue.'

*St. 709 C, Sch. 103. 4. The Version adds the words τε καὶ νομοθετεῖσθαι, which in the Paris MS are added in the margin by a second hand, with the remark ἐν ἄλλῳ εὗρον. Ficino translates these words, and all the editions add them. Just below St. 709 C, Sch. 103. 8 the Armenian suggests ἐνδέχεται instead of ἀνέχεται. Ficino also renders 'suscipit.' In the next line the Arm. omits διὰ συνήθειαν.

St. 709 D, Sch. 103. 14 omits μᾶλλον. The words which follow τὸ δὲ συμπνεῦσαι καὶ καθάπερ ἵππων ζεῦγος καθ᾽ ἓν εἰς ταὐτόν, τὸ λεγόμενον, συμφυσῆσαι have given rise to some discussion. For the Paris MS reads καθ᾽ ἕνα. Whether the Armenian translator read καθ᾽ ἕνα or καθ᾽ ἕν cannot be decided; but he removes καὶ after συμπνεῦσαι and sets it after καθ᾽ ἕν. Immediately below the Version retains ὄντως and τελεωτάτων, which are read in the text of the Paris MS.

*St. 708 E, Sch. 103. 21 Ὠγαθέ, ἔοικα περὶ νομοθετῶν ἐπανιὼν καὶ σκοπῶν ἅμα ἐρεῖν τι καὶ φαῦλον· Ficino renders: "Dum et considerare legum latores et laudare vellem, ad vile quid dictu videor lapsus." Perhaps we may infer that he read ἐπαινῶν for ἐπανιών. The Version omits καὶ σκοπῶν, but retains ἐπανιών. Perhaps καὶ σκοπῶν was added by one who read ἐπαινῶν but was puzzled by the construction περὶ νομοθετῶν ἐπαινῶν.

St. 709 A, Sch. 103. 30. The Version gives instead of ἀνέτρεψε the bad reading ἀνέστρεψε, also given in Stobaeus.

*St. 709 A, Sch. 104. 1. For λοιμῶν the Version has σεισμῶν, after which it retains τε, but omitting καὶ after ἐμπιπτόντων and reading ἀκαιρίᾳ. Assuming that ἀκαιρίαι really stood in his text, the translator read as follows: σεισμῶν τε ἐμπιπτόντων χρόνον ἐπὶ πολὺν ἐνιαυτῶν πολλῶν πολλάκις ἀκαιρίαι. This is a better reading than the other texts yield, for in them λοιμῶν is superfluous after νόσοι, and τε after λοιμῶν. After σεισμῶν, however, τε is in place, and need not be any more bracketed, as it is by Schanz. The only word which the Arm. removes is καὶ, which may have been inserted by one

who rightly failed to see the connection between human disease (λοιμός) and bad harvests (ἀκαιρίαι). The latter might ensue as the result of earthquakes.

St. 709 A, Sch. 103. 3. ἄξειεν, the reading of the Paris MS, is given in the Version. Stob.: ἄρξειεν. Just below in 709 B the Arm. agrees with the Paris Codex and Stobaeus in reading ὅμως, against ὁμοίως of the Apogr. Vatic. In the next line Stobaeus has εὖ λέγοντα λέγειν, but the Version agrees with the Paris MS in giving λεγ. εὖ λέγ.

*St. 709 C, Sch. 104. 14. The Version, literally rendered = nam in hiemali tempore comprendere gubernatoriam maxima efficit, necne et hoc magnum aliquid lucrum ponam artis? We see that it at least retains after κυβερνητικὴν the words ἢ μή, given in the Paris Codex, but rejected by Schanz, in spite of similar uses, like Laws 888 B μέγιστον δέ, ὃ νῦν οὐδὲν ἡγεῖ σύ, τὸ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ὀρθῶς διανοηθέντα ζῆν καλῶς ἢ μή.

*St. 709 C, Sch. 104. 15, 16. The Version gives the words ἢ πῶς to Klinias and omits οὕτως. Badham felt ἢ πῶς to be awkward at the end of the speech of the Athenians, and conjectured σὺ δὲ πῶς. Stobaeus confirms the Armenian in rejecting οὕτως.

St. 709 C, Sch. 104. 17. The Version implies *καὶ ἐν or κἂν, which Ast conjectured. At the end of the speech it omits δεῖν in l. 22. Just before, in line 20, the Arm. has μέλλει, with Stobaeus, against μέλλοι of the Paris MS.

St. 709 D, Sch. 104. 24–105. 2. Schanz in this difficult passage reads ὀρθῶς τι παρὸν and ἐπιδέον. His app. crit. summarizes the various conjectures of scholars. Adopting his reading, the sense is as follows: "Then will not one who has art in one of the directions mentioned (viz. as pilot or physician or legislator) be rightly able to pray for something given him by fortune and only requiring art in addition?" That is, the artist's prayer will be for those conditions to be given by good fortune under which his art will be able to work and produce what is wanted. The paraphrase of the Armenian translator misses the sense: "Will not, then, one who has art in one of the directions mentioned also pray that he may be able to adjust rightly, by means of his art, that which comes by chance?"

*St. 709 D, 105. 5. For τὴν αὐτῶν εὐχὴν the Armenian has τὴν αὐτὴν εὐχὴν, which gives a better sense. Just below the Paris Codex has δή, for which Sch. substitutes ἄν. The Armenian implies δή. After that, in l. 10, the Arm. has *φέρε δή, ὦ νομοθέτα

κ. τ. λ.   Here ὦ is absent from the Paris Codex, but is conjectured by Schanz, Ficino rendering "O legislator."

*St. 709 E.   In the next line the Paris text has ὁ λαβὼν ἕξεις ὥστ' ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν αὐτὸς τὴν πόλιν ἱκανῶς διοικῆσαι; Here ὥστ' gives offence, for, though examples are to hand of its redundant use with the infinitive after δύναμαι, ἱκανὸς, etc., none are adducible of such a use after ἔχω.   The Armenian involves σύγ', which must be the true reading.

*St. 709 E, Sch. 105. 11–16.   The passage which follows is also remedied by the Armenian.   Schanz' reading departs from the Paris Codex more widely and gives a less satisfactory sense.   He reads: ΑΘ. . . . τί μετὰ τοῦτ' εἰπεῖν ὀρθῶς ἔστιν; ἆρα τοῦ νομοθέτου φράζωμεν τοῦτο; ΚΛ. τί γάρ; ΑΘ. [Ναὶ] τόδε· τυραννουμένην μοι δότε τὴν πόλιν φήσει.   Here the Paris Codex has ἢ γάρ, not τί γάρ, and also ναὶ, which "delevit Stallbaum."   The Arm. testifies to the following reading of the passage: ΑΘ. . . . τί μετὰ τοῦτ' εἰπεῖν ὀρθῶς ἔστιν τὸ τοῦ νομοθέτου; ἆρα φράζωμεν τοῦτο; ἢ γάρ; ΚΛ. Ναί. ΑΘ. τόδε κ. τ. λ.   "*Ath.* What shall we rightly set down after this as *the* answer of the legislator?   Shall we indicate this answer?   *Klin.* Yes.   *Ath.* This he will say," etc.   Thus the Armenian only involves the transposition of ἆρα and the addition of τὸ before τοῦ νομοθέτου.   To this addition Ficino also testifies, for he renders: "Quid recte deinde dicitur?   An legum latoris responsio afferri debet?   *Clin.* Utique," etc.   Ast conjectured τὸ before τοῦ νομοθέτου.

*St. 710 A, Sch. 105. 19 καὶ νῦν τῇ τυραννουμένῃ ψυχῇ τοῦτο ξυνεπέσθω is the reading of the Paris MS; but it is the πόλις which three lines before was τυραννουμένη, and not the ψυχή of the τύραννος.   "Affertur alia lectio τῇ τοῦ τυράννου ψυχῇ," notes Stephanus.   The Arm. = "et nunc huic quae a tyranno regitur civitati sequatur anima talis."   Therefore read ψυχῆς τοῦτο 'the despotically ruled city must have, along with the rest, this element of the soul (in its ruler), if it is to profit by the other qualities (of youth, memory, etc.) which he has already got."   That this is the true sense is clear from the words just below in 710 B: ταύτην τοίνυν ἡμῖν κ. τ. λ.   Even if τυραννουμένη be middle, it is still the πόλις, and not the ψυχή, of the ruler which may be said to govern itself despotically or to have despotic institutions.

*St. 710 C, Sch. 106. 10.   The Armenian includes εὐτυχής in the speech of Klinias, and instead of πρόσθες, μὴ κατ' ἄλλο implies πρόσθες μή τι ἄλλο.   Therefore the Armenian had the same text as Ficino,

who renders: "*Cli.* . . . fortis, magnificus atque felix? *Athen.*
Adde nihil aliud, nisi ut," etc. Stephanus would give εὐτυχής to
Clinias.

St. 710 E, Sch. 106. 27. The Arm. implies λέγομεν δὲ ταῦτα
where the Greek MSS have δή.

*St. 711 A, Sch. 106. 32 ταύτῃ καὶ τότε τάχος καὶ ῥᾳστώνη κ. τ. λ.
Schanz writes: "in verbis καὶ τότε haereo." The Armenian omits
τότε. So does Ficino: "ibi celer et facilis fieri mutatio solet."

*St. 711 A, Sch. 107. 2 οὐχ ἅπαξ ἀλλ᾽ οἶμαι πολλάκις. The Arm.
involves οὐχ ἅπ. ἀλλὰ καὶ πολ.

St. 711 B, Sch. 107. 11 πορεύεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν δεῖ πρῶτον ταύτῃ. The
Arm. reads δή for δεῖ. The same reading is in one of Bekker's
codd. Ω.

St. 711 C, Sch. 107. 17. The Arm. agrees with the Paris MS
in reading καὶ πῶς οἰόμεθα without οὐκ.

*St. 711 C, Sch. 107. 32 ἢ τὴν Νέστορος ἐάν ποτέ τις ἐπανενέγκῃ φύσιν.
The verb ἐπαναφέρω is used in three other passages in the Laws,
viz. I 631 A, III 680 D, V 742 C, and always in the sense of 'to
refer or trace a thing back to its source or centre.' In the Politeia
and Cratylus, 434 E and 425 D, it has the same sense; also in
Lysis 219 C. Thus the sense of 'to bring up again or restore
what is past,' which the context requires, is a sense in which
ἐπαναφέρω is never used in Plato. On the other hand, the sense of
'refer back,' in which he always uses it, is here impossible. The
Armenian gives this sense: "vel eam quae Nestoris si quando
quis renovaverit naturam." Ficino renders: "aut si quando
naturam Nestoris quis reduxerit." It is clear that the Arm.
translator read ἐπανανεώσηται or ἀνανεώσηται. Cp. Pol. II 358 B
ἐπανανεώσομαι τὸν θρασυμάχου λόγον. Ast in his lexicon renders
ἐπαναφέρω by *refero*, and gives no reference to this passage in the
Laws. The active ἐπανανεώσῃ would involve less change in the text,
but it has a post-classical air. The uncials ωC might easily have
been confused by a copyist with ΓΚ. Then ἐπανανέγκηται would
have given way to the more usual form ἐπανανέγκῃ. The change
would also be explained if we supposed that the termination ηται
was written as a compendium in some MS of which the Paris MS
is a more or less direct copy, and that this compendium was
wrongly copied. Badham suggested such a theory in explanation
of most of the bad readings of the Paris MS.

*St. 711 E, Sch. 107. 34. In the next line the Arm. omits
ἀνθρώπων. As it is not necessary to the sense and is also omitted

in Ficino's version: "quem . . . multo magis omnibus excelluisse ferunt," we can infer that it was not in the Greek texts used by Ficino and by the Armenian translator.

*St. 711 E, Sch. 108. 4. For ἰόντων λόγων the Arm. has ῥεόντων λόγων, which Ficino also read, for he renders: "et illi quoque beati sunt, qui *fluentia* ex ore modesto audiunt verba."

St. 712 B, Sch. 108. 14, 15. The Armenian translator renders: "conemur accommodantes te civitate, seniores tanquam pueri oratione confingere leges." He misunderstood σοι.

*St. 712 D, Sch. 109. 2, 3 καί τις ἐνίοτε μοι φαίνεται πασῶν τῶν πόλεων δημοκρατουμένη μάλιστ᾽ ἐοικέναι is the reading of the Paris MS. Stephanus, following Ficino's version, which has "nonnunquam tamen," conjectured καί τοι, which Sch. adopts. The Arm. retains τις, but for δημοκρατουμένη has τυραννουμένη or τυραννίδι. The substitution is probably right, since it agrees better with what precedes and renders τις more tolerable. The sense may be 'and in a way (or under some aspects τις) it sometimes appears to me of all states most to resemble a tyranny.' Just below, in l. 7, the Armenian retains the reading of the Paris Codex: ἂν ἐρωτηθείς.

*St. 712 E, Sch. 109. 10. Sch. reads κἀγὼ φαίνομαι where the Paris MS has καταφαίνομαι. Ficino has "mihi quoque, Megille, perinde ac tibi contigisse videtur." The Arm. translator probably read κἀγὼ, for he renders: "Eadem ista affectione, Megille, videor *ego* affici."

St. 712 E, Sch. 109. 16 τὸ τοῦ δεσπότου δὲ ἑκάστη προσαγορεύεται κράτος. The Armenian translator reads ἑκάστης, a vicious reading, if it was really in his text.

St. 712 E. The speech ταὐτόν σοι πάθος is in the Arm. given to the Athenian. Then the speech ὄντως γὰρ κ. τ. λ. to Megillus and τίς δ᾽ ὁ θεός to the Athenian. Then ἆρ᾽ οὖν, etc., to Megillus. Then the words οὐκοῦν—δρᾶν to the Athenian, the words πάνυ μὲν οὖν to Megillus. The Athenian resumes τῶν γὰρ δὴ down to οἰκεῖται, and Megillus has the words σφόδρ᾽ ἂν ὡς, etc. Comp. the editors.

St. 713 A, Sch. 109. 17, 18. The Armenian involves χρῆν δ᾽ εἴπερ τοιούτου τινὸς τὴν πόλιν ἔδει ἐπονομάζεσθαι, *τὸ τοῦ τῶν ἀληθῶς νοῦν ἐχόντων δεσπόζοντος κ. τ. λ. Just below the Arm. has γέ τι, with the Paris Codex, which Sch. corrects to γ᾽ ἔτι.

*St. 713 B, Sch. 109. 25 ἔτι προτέρα τούτων. The Arm. omits τούτων, which is redundant, and not translated by Ficino.

St. 713 C, Sch. 110. 4 τῆς τῶν τότε μακαρίας ζωῆς. The Arm. omits τῶν. Perhaps Ficino did so also, for he renders: "beatae

illius vitae." Just below, in l. 9, the Arm., along with Ficino and
the Paris MS, omits τότε, which Schanz introduces from Julian's
citation.

*St. 713 D, Sch. 110. 11 γένους θειοτέρου τε καὶ ἀμείνονος. For τε
the Armenian has τινος. Ficino and Julian omit τε. Just below,
l. 14, the Arm. retains αὐτοῖσί τινας, which Ficino omits.

St. 713, Sch. 110. 15. The Arm. retains ἄρα after θεὸς, which
Sch. omits, following Julian's citation. The Paris Codex has ἄρα
καί. In the next line, instead of τὸ γένος, the Armenian has *τοῦ
γένους, which Ficino also no doubt read : "similiter deus, homines
amans, genus daemonum *generi* nostro praestantius nobis prae-
fecit." Schanz brackets τὸ, for which Hermann conjectured τότε.

*St. 713 E, Sch. 110. 18. The Arm. has εἰρήνην τε καὶ αἰδῶ καὶ
ἐλευθερίαν καὶ ἀφθονίαν. Schanz adopts the reading of Julian's
citation : εἰρ. τε κ. αἰδῶ καὶ δὴ ἀρθ. The Paris Codex has εἰρ. τε κ.
αἰδῶ καὶ εὐνομίαν (γρ. ἐλευθερίαν) καὶ ἀφθονίαν. Ficino agrees with the
Armenian : "pacemque et pudicitiam, libertatem et iustitiae
copiam proebens."

*St. 713 E, Sch. 110. 22. The Arm. omits οὐδὲ πόνων, which
Ficino retains, but, with Ficino, renders ἀνάφυξις in sense of
'quies.' Both these authorities therefore read ἀνάψυξις, which is
also Julian's reading. This is the only one of Julian's divergences
from the Paris MS which is reflected in the Armenian. *In the
same line the Armenian omits οἴεται, which is not wanted, and
perhaps read δεῖ. In the next line, for τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ Κρόνου λεγόμενον
βίον the Arm. has *τ. ε. τ. Κρ. γενόμενον β., which Ficino also read :
"imitari nos iubet vitam quae sub saturno fuit."

*St. 714 B, Sch. 111. 10 μὴ δὴ φαύλου πέρι. The Arm. has δὲ for
δή. So also Ficino : "neque de re vili," etc.

*St. 714 C, Sch. 111. 13 ff. οὔτε γὰρ πρὸς κ. τ. λ. The Arm. gives
the sense as follows : οὔτε γὰρ . . . τοὺς νόμους, ἀλλ' ὅ τι ἂν καθεστηκυῖα
ἡ πολιτεία ξυμφέρον ᾖ, ὅπως ἄρξει τε ἀεὶ καὶ μὴ καταλυθήσεται, τὸν φύσει
ὅρον, etc. Perhaps the true reading may be καθεστηκυίᾳ ᾗ πολιτείᾳ
ξυμφέρον, ὅπως, etc. The sense of the whole clause would be : "for
they say the laws ought to regard not war nor excellence all round,
but whatsoever is expedient to the established constitution ;
namely, that it may always prevail and never be dissolved, thus
(they say) is the natural definition of the just best stated." The
Armenian has rendered the dative καθεστηκυίᾳ πολιτείᾳ as if it were
nominative and ᾗ as if it were ἥ. In a MS in which no iota
subscript was given, such a blunder was natural enough. The

words ταύτῃ δεῖν, which the Paris Codex adds before τὸ ξυμφέρον, are omitted in the Armenian. Critics have replaced them by all sorts of conjectures, and all are agreed that they are wrong. Ficino's rendering supports in a marvellous way this explanation: "nec enim ad bellum, nec ad omnem virtutem referri leges debere aiunt: sed ad illud potius, quod constitutae reipublicae conferat, quaecunque illa sit, ut dominetur semper nec pereat; iusti que definitionem sic natura optime se habere contendunt." This would be in Greek: ἀλλ' ὅ τι ἂν καθεστηκυίᾳ ἥτις ἂν ᾖ πολιτείᾳ ᾖ ξυμφέρον, ὅπως κ. τ. λ. Supposing this to be the true text, we may suppose that a copyist who did not see that καθεστηκυία and πολιτεία were datives, left out ὅ τι ἂν and wrote ἥτις ἂν instead. Then the introduction of ταύτῃ δεῖν (or ἰδεῖν) would be necessary in order to make sense.

St. 714 C, Sch. 111. 20 λέγ' ἔτι σαφέστερον. Arm. has λέγε τι σαφ.

St. 714 D, Sch. 111. 24. The Arm. adds *ἢ before δῆμον, and just below paraphrases in the following sense: ἢ πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἑαυτῷ (or ἑαυτοῦ) καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ μένειν.

St. 714 E, Sch. 112. 1. The Arm. has ἀδικημάτων, which is read in the Paris Codex.

St. 715 A, Sch. 112. 12. The Arm. seems to have omitted ἤδη. Also Ficino: "millies namque in civitatibus nonnullis id contigit."

*St. 715 A, Sch. 112. 15 τά τε πράγματα κατὰ τὴν πόλιν οὕτως ἐσφετέρισαν σφόδρα. There follows no καὶ to answer τε, and so Stephanus read γε conjecturally. The Arm. involves τά τε πράγματα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν πόλ. οὕ. ἐσφ. and omits σφόδρα. Ficino renders: "adeo ad se solos rem contraxerunt."

St. 715 A, Sch. 112. 18. Is it a mere coincidence by which the Arm. and Ficino both render μήτε αὐτοῖς μήτε ἐκγόνοις as if it were μήτε αὐτῶν τοῖς ἐκγόνοις? Ficino, e. g., has: "ut nullum victis *eorumque* posteris magistratum concesserint."

St. 715 B, Sch. 112. 23. The Arm. retains στασιώτας . . . πολίτας, read in the Paris MS, but for τούτους, which follows, implies ὃ or οὓς, which gives no sense. In the next line it adds *οἰόμεθα, or a word of the same meaning, before μάτην. So also Ficino: "et iura sua frustra sic ab eis vocari *censemus.*"

St. 715 C, Sch. 112. 30 νόμων ὑπηρεσίαν. For νόμων, which is a conjecture, the Arm. retains θεῶν or θεοῦ of the Paris MS; but in the next line the Version implies δ. εἶναι τὴν μεγίστην· τὴν μεγίστην τῷ πρώτῳ. Ficino renders: "deorum quoque cultum et ministerium dabimus; maximum quidem primo."

*St. 715 D, Sch. 113. 9 ὅσα θεοί. The Arm. has ὅσα οἱ θεοί, which Stobaeus also read.

*St. 715 E, Sch. 113. 20. The Arm. has ὤνδρες, which Sch. adopts. Ficino: "O viri." Codex Paris. has ἄνδρες.

*St. 716 A, Sch. 113. 22. The Arm. has εὐθείᾳ περαίνει πάντα κατὰ φύσιν περιφερόμενος. Schelling, Diar. Antiq. 1843, Nr. 88, p. 704, conjectured περιφερόμενος. The Paris MS has περιπορευόμενος and omits πάντα.

*St. 716 A, Sch. 113. 25 ταπεινὸς καὶ κεκοσμημένος. Schanz brackets the last two words, which are 'extra versum' in the Paris MS. Arm. has ταπεινότητι κεκοσμημένος, with which cp. Xenoph. 'Απ. 2, 1, 22 κεκοσμημένην τὸ μὲν σῶμα καθαρότητι, τὰ δὲ ὄμματα αἰδοῖ. In the same line the Arm. implies ὅστις δὲ, or less probably εἰ δέ τις, where the Paris MS has ὁ δέ τις. Just below the Arm. implies ἀνοίᾳ φλέγεται, with the Paris MS.

St. 716 B, Sch. 114. 2. For πάντα ἅμα the Arm. has, with Theodoret, citing this passage, ἅμα πάντα.

St. 716 B, Sch. 114. 7. The Arm. has as follows: Δῆλον δὴ τοῦτό γε, ὡς τῶν ξυνακολουθησόντων τῷ θεῷ, εἰς τὸ μέλλον δεῖ διανοηθῆναι πάντα ἄνδρα. "This much, then, is clear, that we must for the future conceive of every man among those who shall follow along with God." But this is not satisfactory, and ὅτι, which Schanz conjectures before ὡς, is still required. Of course, εἰς τὸ μέλλον may easily have been corrupted into ἐσόμενον, but it seems otiose. The phrase used in the Version, and which I render by εἰς τὸ μέλλον, admits of being put into Greek quite literally by the phrase εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον. In the long speech of the Athenian which follows, the Armenian reflects the Paris MS in the following readings, which Schanz or others find unsatisfactory, viz. St. 716 D, Sch. 114. 18 καὶ ἄδικος. Just below, l. 22, δεῖ where Sch. writes ἀεί. In St. 717 A, Sch. 114. 30 the Arm. has ἐγκαιρότατος. Then Sch. 115, l. 1 ἔφεσις and λεγόμενα, l. 4 ἀρίστεια or ἀριστεία. Then in St. 718 A, Sch. 116, l. 4 Arm. has δαπάνης τε, in l. 6 of same page it has ἄν, which Stobaeus omits. Just below, in l. 10, πρὸς θεῶν. In l. 12, lastly, it has the same lacuna after διέξοδος as the Paris MS. In the following passages, however, in this speech it varies from the Paris Codex:

St. 716 D, Sch. 114. 22. The Arm. has εὐχαῖς καὶ ξύμπασιν ἀναθήμασιν καὶ θεραπείᾳ θείᾳ ὃ καὶ κάλλιστον. Here θείᾳ may be right.

St. 716 E, Sch. 114. 27 omits δῶρα after μιαροῦ. Just below, in l. 29, it renders τοῖς ἀνοσίοις in the sense of τοῖς ἀδίκοις, and in the

next line ὁσίοις in the sense of καθαροῖς. *In the same line it has
for ἅπασιν the nom. sing. ἅπας, which is certainly right, the sense
being that, for the unholy, all their arduous and ample labor is in
vain, but for the pure in heart *every* service (ἅπας), however
humble, is in season, even if it be not ὁ πολύς. Ficino: "quod
opportune faciunt omnes sancti"; so he read ἅπασιν.

*St. 717 A, Sch. 114. 31 βέλη δὲ αὖ. Here the Paris MS has
β. δὲ αὐτοῦ, which is impossible. The Arm. has αὐτὰ or ταῦτα. The
Basle edition already had αὐτὰ. Ficino: "sagittae vero ad illud
quaenam?"

St. 717 B, Sch. 115. 6, 7 τοῖς δὲ τούτων ἄνωθεν down to νυνδή].
The Arm. omits, but since these words are glanced at in Plutarch,
de Iside, p. 361 A, they can hardly be a gloss. Ficino renders
them.

*St. 717 B, Sch. 115. 13 νομίζειν δέ. The Arm. adds δεῖ. This
must have stood in the original Greek, for Ficino also adds it:
"putare enim quisque debet omnia quae possidet eorum esse."

*St. 717 C, Sch. 115. 17. The Armenian reads καὶ after instead
of before ὑπερπονούντων, and in l. 19 δὴ παλαιοῖς for δὲ παλαιοῖς.
These very insignificant changes make the Greek text to run
more smoothly. Ficino's text also must have transposed the καὶ:
"haec omnia videlicet mutuo data persolvens, et pro curis dolo-
ribus*que* priscis parentum, in senecta recentes reddens, quando
maxime indigent."

St. 717 E, Sch. 115. 29 τῶν εἰθισμένων ὄγκον is Schanz' reading.
The Paris MS has ὄγκων, but τῶν εἰθισμένων. Stobaeus has τὸν
εἰθισμένον ὄγκον. The Arm. has τὸν εἰθισμένον νόμον. Ficino: "con-
suetam magnitudinem." Here νόμον might be right, but ὄγκον is
more graphic.

*St. 717 E, Sch. 115. 30. The Paris Codex and Stobaeus share
the vicious reading τοὺς αὐτῶν γεννήτας. Schanz conjectures and
reads τοῖς αὐτῶν γεννηταῖς, which is actually involved by the Arme-
nian and was also read by Ficino: "quae maiores genitoribus
suis struebant."

St. 717 E, Sch. 116. 1. For ἐπιμελείας the Armenian Version
has μνήμας, which is inept. Just below it omits παρεχόμενον, and
translates the entire clause as if it were τῷ (or τὸ) δὲ μὴ παραλείπειν
μνήμην ἐνδελεχῆ αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ τούτῳ μάλιστ' ἀεὶ πρεσβεύειν, δαπάνης τε
κ. τ. λ.

St. 718 B, Sch. 116. 13. For βίᾳ καὶ the Arm. has βιαίᾳ. In
reading an old text a translator might confuse και with ιαι.

*St. 718 B, Sch. 116. 18. The Arm. has παράδειγμα προενεγκόντα, which Ficino also read: "horum exemplum." The Paris MS has δεῖγμα.

St. 718 D, Sch. 116. 30. After λεχθέντα the Arm. introduces this gloss: περὶ θυσιῶν καὶ γονέων. In the next line it omits εἰς τὸ, but in the rest of this hard speech it faithfully reflects the readings of the Paris Codex.

St. 719 A, Sch. 117. 13. The Armenian read φέρειν, with the Paris Codex. Cp. Hesiod, op. 213, for a similar use. Why does Schanz in his text adopt the insipid reading πέλει of the editions of Hesiod? Plato certainly read φέρειν.

*St. 719 A, Sch. 117. 16 εἰ τὸ μέσον αὐτὸ θεῖναι is read in the Paris MS. Badham conjectured αὖ for αὐτὸ, which Schanz adopts. The Arm. omits αὐτὸ. In the preceding line, for ὅ γέ μοι it implies ὥς γέ μοι. Ficino: "verum quo sermonis spectabat progressio, volo in medio vobis proponere." The Armenian also assigns πάνυ μεν οὖν to Clinias.

St. 719 B, Sch. 117. 20. The Arm. omits οὐ before δῆλον, and after it reads ὅ τι.

St. 719 D, Sch. 118. 8. The Arm. omits δεῖ after ἀεὶ.

*St. 719 D, Sch. 118. 13. The Arm. has θάπτειν αὐτὴν 'and if it were commanded to bury her in poetry.' This is better than αὐτήν, read in the Paris MS and implied by Ficino's rendering.

*St. 720 A, Sch. 118. 30. After πρᾳότατον the Arm. omits αὐτόν, which "delevit Badham." Just before, after ἀναμιμνῃσκώμεθα, in l. 28, the Armenian omits δὲ.

*St. 720 C, Sch. 119. 16. The Paris MS has ἑκάστου πέρι νοσήματος ἑκάστου τῶν οἰκετῶν. Schanz notes thus: "unum alterumne ἑκάστου delendum esse videtur." The Arm. has ἑκάστῳ περὶ νοσήματος ἑκάστου τ. οἰκ., which may be right.

*St. 720 E, Sch. 120. 2, 3. The Paris MS, which Schanz follows, has τίν' ἄρα πρῶτον νόμον θεῖτ' ἂν ὁ νομοθέτης; ἆρ' οὐ κατὰ φύσιν τὴν περὶ γενέσεως ἀρχὴν πρώτην πόλεων πέρι κατακοσμήσει ταῖς τάξεσιν; Badham felt this text to be wrong, and conjectured τὸν περὶ γένεσιν, ὡς ἀρχὴν πρώτην πόλεων, πρὶν κατακοσμῆσαι ταῖς τάξεσι. For περὶ Stephanus conjectured παρὰ. The Arm. involves ἆρ' οὐ τὸν κατὰ φύσιν, τὴν περὶ γεν. ἀρ. πόλ. πέρι πρώτην κατακ. ταῖς πράξεσιν; which, however, is not quite satisfactory. Ficino adheres to the text of the Paris MS.

*St. 721 A, Sch. 120. 7 καὶ ἡ κοινωνία is read in the Arm., as also in Codex A Stobaei. Just below the Arm. involves γαμικοὶ δὲ δὴ

νόμοι. The Paris Codex has δὴ and omits δὲ. The codices of Stobaeus have some δὴ and some δὲ, some neither.

*St. 721 A, Sch. 120. 12 ἔχοι δ' ἂν πῶς; ἴσως ὧδε. The Arm. has ἔχοι δ' ἂν ἴσως ὧδε. Badham conjectured πως ἴσως. Ficino: "quae sic se forsan habebit." In next line, for γαμεῖν δὲ the Arm. perhaps implies γαμεῖν γε or γ. δή, but hardly γ. δὲ.

*St. 721 B, Sch. 120. 15, 16. The Arm. has χρήμασι μὲν τόσοις καὶ τοῖς, τῇδε δὲ καὶ τῇ ἀτιμίᾳ. Heindorf conjectured τῇδε δὲ καὶ τῇ ἀτ., of which reading there are traces in the Paris MS and in the MSS of Stobaeus. Ficino: "dedecore autem tali quodam vel tali."

St. 721 B, Sch. 120. 19 διανοηθέντα ὡς ἔστιν ᾗ κ. τ. λ. The Arm.= cogitantem quia sit veritabiliter humanum genus et natura quadam particeps est immortalitatis, which is a bungle.

*St. 721 D, Sch. 120. 31 τόσῳ καὶ τόσῳ. Arm. = τόσῳ καὶ τῷ.

St. 721 D, Sch. 121. 5 πότερον αὐτοὺς διπλοῦς]. The Arm. adds αὐτῶν. αὐτῶν would not be amiss. Just below it retains τῷ μήκει τὸ σμικρότατον.

*St. 722 A, Sch. 121. 14. The Arm. has αἱροίμην, with the Apographum Marcianum. The Paris Codex has ἑροίμην. Lower down in the same speech, l. 29, the Arm. reads μάχην, with the Paris MS.

*St. 722 C, Sch. 121. 33 ἐξ αὐτῶν ὧν νῦν διειλέγμεθα. The Arm.= ex iis etiam nunc a nobis selectis, which corresponds to ἐξ αὐτῶν ὧν νυνδὴ εἱλόμεθα (or ᾑρήμεθα). Schanz notes: "νυνδὴ scribendum videtur." Just below, Sch. 122. 1, for τινα γεγονός the Arm. has *τι γεγονός, which must be right. Ficino read τινα and διειλέγμεθα: "quod per ea, de quibus disseruimus, nobis Deo quodam adspirante factum est."

St. 723 D, Sch. 123. 11 οὐδὲ περὶ ᾄσματος. The Arm. has οὐδὲ γὰρ ᾄσματος, with the Paris Codex. Ficino seems to have had οὐδὲ γὰρ περὶ ᾄσμ., for he renders: "non enim in cantu neque in omni sermone."

*St. 723 E, Sch. 123. 25 μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο. The Arm. involves μ. δὲ τοῦτο δή. The second hand adds ἤδη in margin of the Paris Codex.

*St. 724 A, Sch. 123. 34. The Arm. omits αὐτῶν before ψυχὰς. So also Ficino: "Post illa vero quae ad animos, quae ad corpora," etc. Just below, in l. 35, for προσῆκόν τ' the Arm. has προσῆκον δ'.

The above exhausts, for the IVth book of the Laws, the readings in respect of which the Greek text of the Armenian translator differed from that of the celebrated Paris Codex. Hitherto we

have had but two witnesses to the text of the Laws, to wit, (1) the Paris Codex, of which all our other MSS are copies, more or less remote, and (2) the Latin Version of Ficino, representing an independent Greek text which must have perished towards the beginning of the XVIth century ; and we may rank the ancient authors, chiefly Eusebius and Stobaeus, who have handed us down citations of the Laws, as a third source of testimony. But the variants either implied by Ficino or given in the Florilegists were always liable to doubt, so long as they stood alone. There was no certainty, for example, that an omission or addition or other change in Ficino's Version was more than a device of translation. In Eusebius or Stobaeus similarly they might be due to careless citation. It may be claimed for a version like the Armenian that in scores of passages it removes this uncertainty, which especially attaches to omissions and additions. For wherever it supports a various reading found either in Ficino or the excerptors, we are at once certain that that variant was actually in the Greek text used. In this IVth book there are many passages in which Ficino and the excerptors win such support. In every such case a variant, if it really mends the text, is doubly confirmed; while, in case it does not mend the text, the mere participation in error proves that we have in the Armenian a text which has *pro tanto* had the same history and comes from the same hands as that whose errors it shares. When our collation of the whole of the Armenian Version is concluded, we shall try to exhibit in a summary the new evidence which the Armenian and Latin Versions, in conjunction with one another, afford in respect of the families of the texts of the Laws used by the various excerptors of antiquity, by Stobaeus in particular.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

IV.—SUGGESTIONS ON SOME EPIGRAMS OF THE THIRD VOLUME OF DIDOT'S EDITION OF THE ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA.

This work, which appeared in 1890, has elicited a considerable amount of criticism. In particular, van Herwerden, in his Studia Critica in Epigrammata Graeca (Leiden, 1891), has pointed out the insufficiency of the editor, Cougny, and has made many most excellent corrections of the text of the Epigrams. A large number of these have had the advantage of being previously edited by Prof. Kaibel, whose widely known Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta was published as far back as 1878. The suggestions which I offered in Hermes (1879, pp. 258–62) after a perusal of Kaibel's volume, I wish now to supplement, after a renewed examination of his views and with the extra light supplied by Cougny.

I 328. 5, 6 C [907 Kaibel]:

> Δέρκεό μοι, φίλος, ὧδε νοήμονα τέκτονα χαλκοῦ
> Ἡφαίστου σοφίῃ σῶμα μιμησάμενον.

The original gives σοφιης σωμα, and Kaibel states that this is attested by no less than three copies. Cougny prints σοφίη, from Kaibel; yet it seems possible that σοφίης σῶμα should mean 'a form embodying the skill.' For μιμησάμενον, an almost inconceivable false quantity, the author of the epigram may have written τι μησάμενον.

II 117, on Paris:

> Ἐνθάδε πῦρ τὸ Τρώων Ἑλλάδος ἄλγος ἁπάσης
> ὁ Πριάμοιο Πάρις ψύχομαι ἀκρολόφοις.

Herw. suggests Ἐνθάδε πῦρ Τρώων, [τῆς] Ἑλλάδος ἀ. ἀπ.; possibly Ἐνθάδ' ἐγὼ Τρώων πῦρ. The v. can hardly be without caesura, though the instances quoted by Herwerden show that this sometimes happened in late writers.

170:

> Μικκὸς Μυρσινῶν, παῖς Μυρσίνου, Ἀστακίδου δὲ
> χρηστοῦ γραμματικοῦ θρέμμα ποθεινότατον.

Rather perhaps Μυρσινίων.

172. 4 [96 K.]:

> ἀλλὰ φίλοι τ' ἤμυναν καί μοι κτέρισαν τάφον οὔτηι.

The writer of the inscription may have intended ἐπὶ κτέρισαν τε μοι οὔτ.

174. 3-6 [190 K.]:

> Ἐννεακαιδεκέτης γὰρ ὑπὸ στυγερῆς ἐδαμάσθην
> νούσου, καὶ λείπω τὸν γλυκὺν ἀέλιον
> ἀνίκ' ἔδει με γονεῦσι τίνειν χάριν· ἡ δὲ συνήμων
> ΛΛΘΔ εἰς ἀφανῆ τόνδε.

In v. 6 Böckh conj. Λάθα εἰς ἀφανῆ τόνδε [μ' ἔκρυψε τάφον], a quite uncertain restoration, which Kaibel rejects. No one has objected to the rare word συνήμων. It looks to me wrong; συναίμων was probably the word written by the composer of the epigram. So 231. 5 φιλίοις τε συναίμοις, 7 δισσῶν δὲ συναίμων.

224. 2, 3 [627 K.]:

> μὴ δέομαι γελάσῃς εἰ κυνός ἐστι τάφος.
> Ἐκλαύσθην

ΕΥΛΑΥϹΟΗΝ points rather to Εὖ 'κλαύσθην.

229. 12, 13:

> τῶν ἐπ' ἀτρεκὲς
> δῆθ' ἐξ ἀπάντων τ' ἐσθλὸν ἄρατο κλέος.

Cougny seems rightly to dissever τῶν from the preceding καὶ μῆνις ΑΚΑΡΝΙΑ, whatever may lurk in these letters, at present impossibly supposed to represent ΑΙΑΚΙΔΑΟ.[1] But δῆθ' cannot begin a verse, and it seems probable that ΔΑΘΕΤ or ΔΑΘΕΞ was ἦλθ' ἐξ.

231. 3, 4 [413 K.]:

> ᾧ γόον οὐχ ὑμέναιον ἐδᾳδουχήσατο μήτηρ
> οἰκτρὰ σὺν γενέτῃ Χρυσίον ΩΔΕΞΑΤΟΞ.

Kaibel thinks the last word here contains some lost superlative like οἰκτροτάτῳ. Herwerden conj. ὤλετ' Ἄτος. It looks to me like a real name, a mere mistake for 'Ωδεσάτῳ. The father, Odesatus, and the mother, Chrysion, would naturally be mentioned together as mourning for their child.

---

[1] It is more likely to have been a fem. in -ειᾰ, like Ἑκτόρεια Rhes. 762, Διομήδεια Eccles. 1029, Πολυδεύκεια Ἀγαμεμνόνεια.

236. 7, 8 [547 K.]:

> Ἥδε γὰρ, ἡνίκα πνεῦμα μελῶν ἀπέλυε Φίλιππος
>]ν ἀκροτάτοις χείλεσι προσπελάσας,
> στᾶσα λιποψυχοῦντος ὑπὲρ γαμέτου Πώμπτιλλα
> τὴν κείνου ζωὴν ἀντέλαβεν θανάτου.

Lebas, whose restoration of this epigram is generally satisfactory, does not seem to me right in his λοίσθιον, at the beginning of 8. Cougny prints σιγὴν: this too is unlikely. Perhaps the word was ψυχὴν. Philippus was on the point of death: his life hung on his lips, ready to be dismissed.

268. 5, 6 [570 K.]:

> Ἀλλ' ἄγ' Ἀλεξάνδρα κἂν φίλατο, μηκέτ' ὀδυρμοὺς
> ἱμερτῇ κούρῃ σπένδετε μυρόμενοι.

This must have been

> Ἀλλ' ἄγ' Ἀλεξάνδραν κεἰ ἐφίλατε, μηκέτ' ὀδυρμοὺς κτλ.

D'Orville thought this was the sense required: 'sed age, licet Alexandra amata fuerit, ne amplius lamenta desiderabili puellae libate querentes.' He, however, reads Ἀλεξάνδρα κἂν φίλατο, taking φίλατο as passive. My emendation does less violence to Greek, and might explain the errors of the inscription. There must have been a transference of the ν from Ἀλεξάνδραν, which caused κεἰ to be changed to κἂν.

If the above view is right, the name added in prose at the end of the inscription cannot be the name of the girl. D'Orville prints Τιθήνη Ὑγεία; Kaibel prints Τινηίᾳ Ὑγείᾳ.

300 [636 K.]:

> Εὕρεσιν ἐνθάδε γῆ κατέχει θανάτοιο λαχοῦσαν
> μητέρα τὴν εὔτεκνον· εὐδαίμονες παροδῖται.

This epigr. was so restored by Hermann from the Latin letters of the original. The second v. might be ἰὸν δαίμων, παροδῖται; or, less probably, ἴθ' εὐδαίμων, παροδῖτα; cf. 325. 1.

322 [592 K.]:

> Ὧδ' Ἐπάφου γέννημα, σοφοῖς ἐπιείκελος ἀνήρ
> κεῖμαι, Ῥωμαίων σπέρμα πολυκτεάνων
> Κληζόμενος Δέκμος Σερουίλιος, εἰς ἔτη ἐλθὼν
> ἐννέα που δεκάδων καὶ τρία, ὡς ἔλεγον.

As Kaibel observes, Decimus Servilius seems to have been an

astrologer, who predicted rightly the exact amount of his own life. ἔλεγον is thus 1st person: for ὡς I suggest ὅσ' οὖν.

333. 2 [261*b* K.]:

> τῇ ψυχῇ μεταδὸς καλῶν ΤΕΧΘΕΙΣ
> καὶ τὸν βίον τρυφῇ παρηγόρησον
> εἰδὼς ἢν καταβῇς ἐς πῶμα λήθης
> 5 οὐχ ἐν τῶν ἐπάνω κάτω που ὄψει
> ψυχῆς ἐκ μελέων ἀποπταθείσης.

2. ὁ τεχθεὶς, Böckh; τεχθείσῃ vel δοθείσῃ vel τραφείσῃ, Kaibel; καλῶν τεχνῶν σῇ, Herwerden. τάχιστα ego. 3. καὶ τρυφῇ βίοτον π., Böckh, uix probabiliter: fort. τὸν ζῶντα. 4. πόμ' ἐς τὸ Λήθης, Böckh; cf. 559. 10. Num σὺ δῶμα?

τάχιστα seems quite in keeping with the apolaustic tone of the hendecasyllables. In 3 βιοτὴν would be a better word than βίοτον; but I think the original may have been τὸν ζῶντα 'thy living self.' Again, I doubt Böckh's πόμ' ἐς τὸ Λήθης; the corruption is more easily explained by σὺ δῶμα Λ., a perfectly intelligible combination.

340. 1, 2 [222 K.]:

> τὸν δ' ἀρετὰν ἀμείψασα Λεοντέα Εὐρυδίκοιο
> τίμησεν πάτρα γυμνάδος ἐν τεμένει.

Kaibel gives ἀρετᾷ λάμψαντα, which appears to me an unnecessary and not very probable change. The easiest emendation is τόνδ' ἀρετᾷ 'μείψασα 'requiting with kindness' or 'goodness' for his good service to the city.

346. 3, 4 [*663 K.]:

> Αἰεὶ δὲ μνήμῃ σε φυλάξομεν ὡς παρεόντα
> εἵνεκεν ἠείας εἵνεκα τ' ἀγλαΐης.

Herwerden has restored this most convincingly εἵνεκ' ἐνηείας.

348. 8 [566*a* K.]:

>]ηλεόθυμε Χάρων τί σε τόσσον ἐνῆις
>]υψε λιποῦσα πατρὶ πένθος ἀπειρέσιον;

None of the supplements mentioned by Böckh, nor yet that of Kaibel, satisfy. The first of the two verses, I imagine, began with an interjection, οἴμοι, or something similar. If υψε is rightly reported in the second, κρύψε might be the word. *Eheu inmitis Charon, cur tam bona te celauit quod relinqueret patri dolorem inmensum ?*

361. 3, 4 [329 K.], over a dog:

> Δουλίδα καὶ σύμπλουν πολλῆς ἁλὸς· ἦ κε παράσχοις
> ἀνθρώποις ἀλόγοις ταὐτὰ χαριζομένη.

So Cougny, after Aeneas Piccolomini; the original gives TIN
καὶ παράσχοις. Is not ἀλόγοις an error for ἀλόγῳ 'a brute'? E. L.
Hicks conj. ἄν, i. e. ἆ ἄν.

386. 1 [299 K.]:

> Εὐσεβὲς εἰς θρέψασαν, Διοκλῆ, ὁσιώτατε πάντων
> Κουφοτάτης φίλτρον ἃ λίθος . . .

As the name Diocles is prefixed to the inscr., Διοκλῆ seems to
have supplanted a word, possibly ἕδρας. The other v. may have
ended εἰ κόνιος: I do not understand εἰ φιλίης.

395. 2 [265 K.]:

> ἃς κλέος ἐν Κρήτᾳ μίμνεται ἀθάνατον.

Herwerden reasonably objects to μίμνεται, offering instead
λείπεται or γίγνεται. It might be μίμνει ἔτ'.

426. 9, 10 [615 K.]:

> Κεύθει γαῖα φίλη με. τί δ' ἀγνὸν ὅμως ὄνομ'; ἤμην
> πᾶσι Φιλητὸς ἀνὴρ τῆς Λυκίης Λιμύρων.

This is the correction of Wilamowitz. The letters of the
original, as reported by Kaibel, are ONO/NHΛH or ONO/
MAMHN. I doubt ὅμως, which seems to have little meaning, and
offer τί δ' ἀγνὸν ὅπως ὀνομήνῃς; 'what does it matter how you name
(what name you give to) a righteous man?' Then φιλητὸς will be
a mere adj.: 'I was a man well loved by all, of Lycian Limyra.'

453. 13, 14 [646 K.]:

> τοῦτ' ἔσομαι γὰρ ἐγώ· σὺ δὲ τούτοις γῆν ἐπιχώσας
> ΕΙΠΕ . ΟΤΕ . ΟΥΚΗΝ τοῦτο πάλιν γέγονα.

Such is Kaibel's report: Orelli gives ΕΙΠΕΟΙΕΟΥΚΗΝ. The
passage has been dealt with by Hecker in Anth. Graec. I, p. 196,
and Meineke, Callim., p. 298. The former edits Εἴφ' ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἦν
τοῦτο πάλιν γέγονα; and so Meineke, except that he writes ὅ, τι, alter-
ing besides σὺ δὲ τούτοις into σὺ δ' ἐπ' ὀστοῖς or σὺ δέ γ' ὀστοῖς. A
relative[1] seems required to correspond to τοῦτο, but the tradition
of the letters is not quite certain. Possibly they point to

---

[1] Orelli, however, conj. εἰπέ· πότ' οὐκ ἤμην· τοῦτο π. γέγονα. [Cougny.]

ΕΙΠΕΤΟΓΩΝΟΥΚΗΝ 'dic, id quod cum essem, nondum eram, iterum me hoc factum esse.' Say 'that I have returned to that, at the time of being which I had as yet no existence.'

459. 4 [587 K.]:

> Ἑπτὰ μόνους λυκάβαντας δύω καὶ μῆνας ἔζησα

If we compare 505. 1, 2 Εἰκοσιὲξ λυκάβασιν ἐγὼ ζήσασα Σαβῖνα καὶ μησὶν τέτρασιν, εἶθ' ἑνδέκατον πάλιν ἦμαρ, we may believe that μόνους λυκάβαντας is an error for μόνοις λυκάβασι.

514. 3 [604 K.]:

> Μαρκιανὸς δέ μ' ἔθαψε καὶ ἐκήδευσεν ὁδῖται.

'ἐκήδευσεν augmenti syllaba male producta,' Kaibel. Yet τε might easily fall out when the epigram was engraved; and nothing proves careless metre on the part of the epigrammatist.

520. 3 [608 K.]:

> Συμπάσχων κείνοις οἷσπερ κινεῖτο προσώποις.

Manil. V 479:

> Externis tamen aptus erit nunc uoce poetis,
> Nunc tacito gestu, referetque affectibus ora,
> Et sua dicendo faciet, solusque per omnis
> Ibit personas et turbam reddet in uno.

531. 1 [*266 K.]:

> Κοινὸν φῶς ἰδοῦσα τὸ κοινὸν ἔχω τέλος αἰεί.

Add πρὶν after φῶς.

548. 1, 2:

> ὡς ῥόδον εἰαρινόν σε βροτοφθόρος ἥρπασεν Ἀΐδης
> Σέμνην· τλητὰ θεὸς ζωῆς †ἀφίλαμεν αὐτῇ.

Cougny corrects τλητὰ θεὸς ζωῆς †ἀφεῖλέ μ' ἐν αὐτῇ. Following in his footsteps, I would write Σέμνη (vocative)· ἄτλητα θεὸς ζωῆς ὅσ' ἀφεῖλέ μ' ἐν αὐτῇ. ζωῆς might depend on ἄτλητα, or perhaps on ὅσ'. 'Unendurable is the loss to my life that the God brought me in her dying.'

555. 2 [1051 K.]. The word ἔοι in this inscript. should not be altered to ἔφυ, which in no way suits it.

564. 6 [395 K.]:

> καὶ κατέθηκεν [ἄγων] ἔνθα περ οἱ πρόγονοι.

ἄγων is a possible supplement.

566. 4 [373 K.]:[1]

Κεῖμαι ἐρῶν πολλῶν, ἐράμενος πλεόνων.

The monument gives ε . . μενος, which Welcker would retain as ἐράμενος. Wilamowitz conj. ἐσσόμενος, with ἔρως for ἐρῶν. The antithesis of the two clauses in this way perhaps becomes more pointed; but the space, as given by Le Bas, leaves room only for two letters. Le Bas' conj., ἠράμενος, appears to me worth consideration: it might be a passive participle fluctuating in form between a strict perfect ἠρασμένος and an aorist with passive meaning: so οὐτασμένος, οὐτάμενος. The meaning, if ἐρῶν is right (E' is all that remains), must be 'loved by more.'

III 171. 5, 6. These verses I would write thus, as formerly conjectured in the Cambridge Journal of Philology for 1877, p. 259:

τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτὸ κακὸν μέγα σύμβολον ἄλλων
'Εστί· τόσον τούτῳ τῷ πυρὶ πῦρ ἕτερον.

'This, in itself a great evil, is a sign of others to come: there is a second fire as great to complete this fire': unless it seems preferable to punctuate ἄλλων. Ἔστι τόσον.

175. This epigram is to be explained, not of night-watchmen patrolling the streets with torches, but of men moving round in a mill by moonlight. The moon speaks.

Εἴς τινας νυκτὸς ἀλοῶντας, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς Σελήνης.
Ἅρματος ἡμετέρου τίς ἔβησεν ἐλάστορας ἄλλους,
δῖνον ἀειστρεφέα παντόσ' ἐλαυνομένους;
Ἥλιε, τεθρίπποις νεμεσήσῃς μηκέτι μούνοις.
οἵδ' ἐπιτολμῶσιν ἡμετέροις τε δίφροις.

These men of the mill, thus moving round in the moonlight, are fancifully represented as driving the moon's chariot. The sun is therefore told that his anger at Phaethon's usurping his horses and chariot has found a parallel in the usurpation of the moon's chariot by the νυκτὸς ἀλοῶντες. I cannot understand how these words can refer to ἀλᾶσθαι; or how the dative τεθρίπποις can mean 'propter quadrigas tuas' (Herwerden). The single point of language which calls for remark is the use of τε, which here corresponds closely to Latin *que = quoque* in *hodieque,* and similar cases cited in my Catullus, CII 3.

---

[1] The actual remaining letters of the inscription are given in Revue de Philologie, 1845, p. 334, by Le Bas.

197. This epigram is clearly in scazons. It may, with no great deviation from its recorded form, be thus restored:

> ὁ γαυριῶν μέγιστα Περσικῷ στίφει,
> καὶ Βόσπορον πλοῦν ξηρὸν ὡσπερεὶ δείξας,
> Ξέρξης ὁ βασιλεύς, Δαρίου παῖς κἀτόσσης.
> Ἰαόνων ἄθυρμα δείκνυται θραυσθείς.

IV 49 [1029 K.]:

> Οὐρανίων πάντων βασιλεῦ χαῖρ', ἄφθιτ' Ἄνουβι,
> σός τε πατὴρ χρυσοστέφανος πολύσεμνος Ὄσειρις,
> αὐτὸς Ζεὺς Κρονίδης, αὐτὸς μέγας ὄβριμος Ἄμμουν,
> κοίρανος ἀθανάτων ΠΡΟΤΕΤΙΜΗΤΑΙΣΕ Σέραπις,
> σή τε, μάκαιρα θεά, μήτηρ, πολυώνυμος Ἶσις.

If Cougny has rightly recorded the capitals, they would more naturally be an error for προτετίμησαί τε than for προτετίμηται δέ. A similar displacement of syllables perhaps exists in 1015. 2 K. φεισάμενοι χώρης ΠΥΡΙΔΑΜΑΖΟΜΕΝΗΣ, where I suggested that the right reading was πυραμίδ' ἀζομένης (Hermes for 1879, p. 260), and in VI 261. 8, where ἧς ὑπερηώρησαι ὁρίνων φωτὶ σεαυτόν may be a mistake for ἧσπερ ὑπ' ἠώρησαι (Herwerden ᾖ or ᾖ γ' ὑπερ.).

92. 5, 6:

> Γαῖα βροτὸς καὶ ὕδωρ· τὰ ἀπ' αὐτόφιν εἰς τάδε δύνει.
> ὥστε μάτην ὁ βίος καὶ ὅσα τις πονέει.

Rather χῶσα τις ἐκπονέει.

VI 8:

> Εἰς πόλιν ἣν κτίσητε (κτίζησθα Bücheler and Kiessling,
> κτίζει most MSS) θεοῖς σέβας ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ
> θεῖναι καὶ φυλακαῖς τε σέβειν θυσίαις τε χοροῖς τε.

This is from an oracle which Dionysius of Halicarnassus cites (Antiqq. I 68) as given to Dardanus, when he transferred his home, with the Palladia and images of the gods, from Samothrace to Asia. The historian introduces the oracle with these words: διαμαντευόμενον δὲ περὶ τῆς οἰκήσεως τά τε ἄλλα μαθεῖν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τῆς φυλακῆς τόνδε τὸν χρησμὸν λαβεῖν. In c. 69 he says ποιήσασθαι τοὺς Ἰλιεῖς νεών τε καὶ ἄδυτον αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ἄκρας καὶ φυλάττειν δι' ἐπιμελείας ἧς ἐδύναντο πλείστης. Hence it would seem that there is ground for defending φυλακαῖς. But Herwerden justly calls attention to the combination φυλακαῖς σέβειν as odd, and conj. either καί σφεας αἰὲ σέβειν or καὶ τελεταῖς τε σέβειν. After reading his note (Stud. Critic.

in Epigr. Graec., p. 84) it occurred to me that the word which had been supplanted by φυλακαῖς might be φιάλαις: libations would be a natural adjunct of sacrifice and dancing.

31. 4:

καί τε χορῶν στεφάνωμα πικροὺς οἰκήτορας ἕξει.

Neither Schubart, in his edition of Pausanias, nor Cougny remarks on this extraordinary χορῶν. I cannot but believe it to be a mere error for καί τ’ ἐχυρόν. The word στεφάνωμα has the same meaning in Sophocles, Antig. 122 στ. πύργων.

81. 16:

Ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε δέμας θύσας ζωοῖο ποτηνοῦ
καὶ μέλι φυρήσας †δηίῳ ἀλφίτῳ ἔνθεν
ἀτμούς τε λιβάνοιο καὶ οὐλοχύτας ἐπίβαλλε.

δηίῳ seems to be a corruption of Δηωίῳ, from Δηώ: 124. 7 Cougny λήια δ’ εὐαλδῆ κομέειν σταχυιτρόφα Δηοῖ. The adj. recurs, I think, in 196. 4 εἰς χθόν’ ἐπειγομένως Δηώιον αἴσσουσι.

92. 3, 4, oracle on Alexander the Great:

ὃν Ζεὺς †ἀρίσταισι γοναῖς ἔσπειρεν· ἀρωγὸν
εὐνομίης θνητοῖσιν Ἀλέξανδρον βασιλῆα.

Cougny gives ἀρρήταισι, surely a strange form: possibly ῥηίσταισι or ῥαίσταισι.

94. 1 [Suidas, s. v. Τόνος]:

Αἰακίδη προφύλαξαι μολεῖν Ἀχερούσιον ὕδωρ.

προφύλαξο Gaisford, after Toup and Valckenaer: possibly πεφύλαξο, as in 205. 4 Cougny.

102. 7–9 [1037 K.]:

Δίψῃ δ’ εἴμ’ αὔη καὶ ἀπόλλυμαι· ἀλλὰ δότ’ αἶψα
ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ προρέον τῆς Μνημοσύνης ἀπὸ λίμνης.

These vv. strangely recall Propertius’ elegy on the thirst of Hercules, IV 12. 8.

172. 10 [1035 K.]:

φαίην κ’ ἀτρεκέως ἀψεύδεσιν ΑΛΚΑΙΣΙιΟΜο
ὡς μὴ δηρὸν ὑπ’ ἀργαλέῃ τρύοιτό γε νούσῳ
Αἰακίδης λαός.

Böckh conj. ἀψεύδεσι νάμασιν ὀμφῆς, Kaibel ἀψεύδεσιν ἄλκαρ ἐπ’ ὀμφαῖς, which he calls ‘certa coniectura.’ Cougny gives ἀ. ᾄσμασιν ὀμφῆς. The suggestion of Kaibel is in my opinion right, but not

the words, which may more plausibly be restored ἀψεύδεσιν ἄρκεσιν ὀμφαῖς. ἄρκεσις = ἐπάρκεσις is found in Sophocles.

188. These vv., which are cited in a prose abridgment, except v. 1, by Cedrenus, Histor. Compend. I 20, and Suidas, s. v. Θοῦλις, I would write conjecturally thus, slightly otherwise than as Herwerden, p. 87 :

> πρῶτα θεός, μετέπειτα λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα σὺν αὐτοῖς.
> σύμφυτα ταῦτα δὲ πάντα καὶ εἰς ἓν ἰόντα τέτυκται.
> οὖ κράτος εἰς αἰῶνα· σὺ δ' ὠκέσι ποσσὶ βάδιζε
> θνητέ,

The rest of v. 4 is hardly recoverable from the words ἄδηλον διανύων βίον of both Cedrenus and Suidas.

193. 1, spoken of Hecate:

> Ἡδ' ἐγώ εἰμι κόρη πολυφάσματος οὐρανόφοιτος.

Rather οὐρεσίφοιτος, Catullus' *cultrix montibus*. Christod. Ecphr. 306 Φοίβου οὐρεσίφοιτος ὁμόγνιος ἵστατο κούρη. Orph. hymn. I 7, to Hecate, Ἡγεμόνην, νύμφην, κουροτρόφον, οὐρεσιφοῖτιν.

194 (Euseb. Praep. Evang. V 7) :

> οὐδὲν ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς ποτ' †ἀδείματον
> οὐδ' ἀκράαντον ἔλεξε σοφοῖς Ἑκάτη θεοφήταις.

Cougny prints the usually received ποτε δῖα μάταιον, which is found in several MSS. I should prefer ποτε δεῖμα μάταιον.

200. 1, 2 (Euseb. Praep. Evang. V 15) :

> τίς βροτὸς οὐ πεπόθηκε χαρακτῆρας ὀπάσασθαι
> χρυσοῦ καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου αἰγλήεντος ;

Herwerden conj. πάσασθαι = κτήσασθαι. I think it may be χαρακτῆρ' ἀσπάσσασθαι.

202. 1 (Philopon. de Creat. Mundi, IV 20) :

> Λυέσθω φύσεως δεσμὰ ἵνα σοῖσι πίθωμαι

The balance of clauses points to ἐμὰ δέσμ' ἵνα σοῖσι π.

203 (Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. III 7). Gaisford has admirably restored this from the Paris MS, as follows :

> ὅττι μὲν ἀθανάτη ψυχὴ μετὰ σῶμα προβαίνει
> γιγνώσκεις· σοφίης τετμημένη αἰὲν ἀλᾶται.
> ἀνερὸς εὐσεβίῃ προφερεστάτου ἐστὶν ἐκείνη
> ψυχή.

It is inexcusable in Cougny not to have examined Gaisford's edition (Oxford, 1852).

216. 26, oracle ap. Phlegon. Mirabil. X :

> σεμνὴν Πλουτωνίδα παντοδίδακτοι
> ἐν πάτρᾳ εὐχέσθων μίμνειν.

παντοδίδακτοι should not be altered to παντοδίδακτον, an epithet not specially suited to Persephone. It refers to the careful training of the ministering priests in all the details of the cultus.

29-31 :

> θησαυρὸν δ' ἕτεροι καὶ παρθένοι ἔνθα φερόντων·
> ἱστῷ θειοπαγεῖ νυμφάσματα ποικίλα σεμνὴν
> Πλούτωνι κοσμεῖτο ὅπως σχεσίῃσι κακοῖσι.

29. an θησαυρόνδε? κόροι *pro* ἕτεροι *Emper.* 30. νυμφάσματα *in* καὶ ὑφάσματα *mutauit Emper : potest esse* ἐνυφάσματα. 31. an κοσμοῖντο *uel* κοσμοῖεν Πλουτωνίδ'? σχέσις ᾖσι *Xylander.* κακοῖο *ex* 49 ὅπως λύσις ᾖσι κακοῖο *reponendum erat.*

. I make ἐνυφάσματα depend on ἱστῷ θειοπαγεῖ, and suppose an asyndeton after ποικίλα. But the passage is very doubtful. Yet the pause after the fifth foot, ποικίλα, recurs in 38 λαμπροῖς εἵμασι κοσμητοῦ μετὰ ποιμένος, ὅστις.

47, 48 :

> ἀτὰρ οἴδατε πάντες
> λισσέσθω Φοῖβον Παιήονα.

Cougny translates οἴδατε as an imperative. Surely it is indic.: 'you all know'='as you all know.'

50 sqq.:

> ὑμνεῖν αἵ κε γένει προφερέστεραι ὣσ' ἐνὶ λαοῖς
> καὶ νήσων ναέται τὴν ἀντιπάλων ὅταν αἶαν
> οὐ δόλῳ ἀλλὰ βίᾳ Κυμαῖδα πρόφρονες αὖται (?)
> νάσσωνται σεμνῆς βασιληΐδος οἵσετίθενται
> 55 ἐν πατρίοισι νόμοις Ἥρας ξόανόν τε κατ' οἶκον.
> ἵξει δ' ἂν μύθοισιν ἐμοῖς τάδε πάντα τίθηνται
> σεμνοτάτην βασίλισσαν ἐπέλθῃς ἐν θυσίαισιν.

Though the exact allusion in 51-3 is uncertain, it seems dangerous to alter the words τὴν ἀντιπάλων ὅταν αἶαν to τῶν ἀγχιάλων ὅταν εἶεν, as C. Müller suggested, Fragm. Hist. Graec. III, p. 620 ; for the construction of the words given in the MS tradition is at least coherent, καὶ νήσων ναέται ὅταν νάσσωνται τὴν ἀντ. αἶαν, whereas, if Müller's conj. be received, it is difficult to see why εἶεν should be substituted for ὧσι, and not easy to elicit any quite satisfactory meaning from the verses following. Cougny seems to me to be

right here in his retention of the MS reading. But in the next vv. emendation is easier and comparatively sure. I would write οἷσι τιθῆται Ἐν πατρίοισι νόμοις Ἥρας ξόανόν τι κατ᾽ οἶκον. And if οἷσι is right, it is probable that v. 52 ended with οὗτοι.

In 55 Emper altered τίθηνται to πίθηαι, which is printed by Otto Keller in his edition of the Paradoxographi (1877, Teubner). This cannot be considered certain: τιθῆται might mean 'is instituted,' and is very much nearer τίθηνται. But σεμνοτάτην must contain something which connects with the v. preceding and gives a construction to ἐπέλθῃς: this is, I believe, Σεμνά τε τήν. The whole passage, then, I would write thus :

> ὑμνεῖν αἵ κε γένει προφερέστεραι ὦσ᾽ ἐνὶ λαοῖς,
> καὶ νήσων ναέται, τὴν ἀντιπάλων ὅταν αἶαν,
> οὐ δόλῳ ἀλλὰ βίᾳ Κυμαῖδα, πρόφρονες οὗτοι
> νάσσωνται, σεμνῆς βασιληίδος οἷσι τιθῆται
> ἐν πατρίοισι νόμοις Ἥρας ξόανόν τι κατ᾽ οἶκον.
> ἵξει δ᾽, ἂν μύθοισιν ἐμοῖς τάδε πάντα τιθῆται,
> σεμνά τε τὴν βασίλισσαν ἐπέλθῃς ἐν θυσίαισιν·

The words οὐ δόλῳ ἀλλὰ βίᾳ Κυμαῖδα seem to imply that the territory had been violently seized by the Cumaeans, and that they had subsequently been dispossessed by the islanders (οὗτοι).
62 sqq.:

> νηφαλίμων ἀρνᾶν τε ταμὼν χθονίοις τάδε ῥέξον
> ἦμος ἂν ἤδη ἔχοις μεγαλήτην οὐκ ἄπαντη
> ξεστοδόταν ξοάνῃσιν καὶ τἆλλ᾽ ὅσ᾽ ἔλεξα σαφι
> 65 ἐν πετάλοισιν ἐμοῖς· ὑπὸ κερκίδος ἀμφὶ καλύπτρας
> ἵμερτός σε βάλεν γλαυκῆς ἐλάας πολυκάρπου
> ἀγλαὰ φύλλα λαβοῦσα λύσιν κακοῦ.

In 63 μεγαλήτην can hardly be μεγάλην θεόν: it should contain ἀλοιτ- or ἀλειτ- (ἀλιτεῖν): possibly the dative plur. μεγαλοίτισιν 'great sinners,' viz. females, who had violated the laws of chastity or marriage, and to whom Hera would be hostile (ἀνάντη), and therefore requiring propitiation (οὐκέτ᾽). The following v. may easily be restored: ξεστὰ δ᾽ ὅταν ξόαν᾽ ᾖσι καὶ ἀλλ᾽ ὅσ᾽ ἔλεξα σαφηνῆ (σαφηνῇ, Alexander). 65, 66 are more doubtful, possibly ὑπὸ κερκίδος ἀμφὶ καλύπτραις Ἱμερτοῖσι βαλεῖν κτλ. In this way the difficulty of λαβοῦσα is avoided: it could hardly be λαβόντα. βαλεῖν is the infinitive used for the imperative.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

NOTE.

SOME ERRORS IN HARPERS' LATIN DICTIONARY.

The following collection of errors in our standard Latin lexicon owes its origin to similar notes published by Prof. Humphreys in this Journal (VIII, p. 344). None of the errors mentioned below have been sought for; they have all been stumbled on, and some of them have been first noticed by keen-eyed pupils. It might be well if other teachers of the Classics would make public their lists of marginal corrections, for the sake of a future edition.

I.—*Misprints.*

1) **Wrong quantities:** *caveo* is marked 3d conjugation instead of 2d; the past participle of *confīdo* is given as *confīsus* instead of *confīsus*; *fortē* for *forte*; *quandocumquē* for *quandocumque*; *quandoquē* for *quandoque*; *temporē* for *tempore*.

2) **Wrong references:** Under *animadverto*, the last example is quoted Cic. Or. 3. 12, instead of de Or. 3. 12. 44; under *carrus*, reference is made to Caesar, B. G. 3. 51, though there are only 29 chapters in Book III; as the passage is not quoted, the true reference cannot be given; under *flexus*, I, the expression *flexus metae* is quoted from Pers. 3. 63 instead of 3. 68; under 1. *intentus*, A, *arcus intentus* is quoted from Cic. Sen. 10. 37 instead of 11. 37; under *irritamentum* the expression *irritamentum Veneris languescentis* is quoted from Juv. 11. 16 instead of 11. 167; under *jam*, I D, the quotation accredited to Caes. B. G. 2. 21 should be 2. 20.

3) **Miscellaneous misprints:** *elaborare* (s. v. I δ) is said to take an acc. and inf. as object in Quint. 3. 8. 58. The word accusative should be omitted from this statement; in the passage quoted, however, the preferred reading is now *laborarunt*, not *elaborarunt*. In the list of Abbreviations (p. ix) Lampridius is said to have died 300 B. C., instead of A. D. *rescisco* is marked neuter instead of active. Under *spes*, I A, δ, a passage is quoted from Cic. Off. 2. 15. 53 reading *ut . . . putaris* instead of *putares*.

II.—*Other Errors.*

1) *Apotheca* is not the source from which French *boutique*, German *Bude*, English *booth* are derived.

2) *constituo* is cited as governing an acc. and inf. in Cic. ad Att. 7. 7. 4. This is a mistake; the passage gives an example of the simple infinitive after *constituo*.

3) *Davus* as a slave's name is said to be frequent in Plautus and Terence. It is mentioned only once in Plautus, and that incidentally, viz. Amph. 361.

4) *ductant* occurs in Plautus, Mil. Glor. 93, with the meaning *make fun of*, which is rightly given to it under *labia*; under *ducto* the meaning is wrongly given as *charm, allure.*

5) Under *expello* the phrase *a patria expellere* is cited from Cic. Sest. 13. 30, where the proper reading is *ex patria.*

6) In Livy 28. 35. 8 *frater* means *brother-in-law*, i. e. *a sister's husband*, but it is not correct to say that it is there used for *levir* (see under *frater*, II C, 2), inasmuch as *levir* only means *a husband's brother.*

7) Juvenal's famous *manum ferulae subducere* (1. 15) is. explained (under *manus*, I) not as meaning *to flinch from*, but *to be too old for the rod.*

8) *meta* does not mean *goal* in either of the two examples cited, viz. Hor. A. P. 412 and Verg. Aen. 5. 159. Nor does it have that meaning in the example quoted by Wilkins, in his note on the Horatian passage, from Varro, L. L. 8. 16. 31.

9) *praetextus* is illustrated by a reference to Tac. Hist. 1. 76; but the reading there is *praetexto*, so that this reference should be under *praetextum.*

10) In defining *quadra* a special heading is set aside for the meaning *dining-table*, a meaning that the word nowhere has, at least certainly not in the two examples cited for it. Round loaves of bread were marked off into *quadrae* by depressions starting from the centre of the upper surface and carried in straight lines to the edge of the loaf. In Vergil, Aen. 7. 115, the term is applied to such cakes used as plates to lay the rest of the food on. Juvenal's (5. 2) *aliena vivere quadra* is *to live off another's loaf*, rather than *table.*

11) Under *quamquam*, γ, is cited an example from Cic. Fam. 2. 7. 3, where the approved reading now is *quamque.*

12) *rhetor* in Hor. Sat. 1. 10. 12 has the meaning of *orator* ; hence remove the star before this definition.

13) Under *tego* the adverb derived from the past participle should be given as *tecte*, not *tecto*.

14) *forset* seems well enough established in Hor. Od. 1. 28. 31, and *transmineret* in Plaut. Mil. Glor. 30 to find a place in the Lexicon.

15) A number of other errors have been corrected by Wilkins in his notes on the Epistles of Horace. See note on *curare*, Ep. 2, 2. 151; *furnus*, Ep. 1. 11. 13; *mango*, Ep. 2. 2. 13; *miluus*, Ep. 1. 16. 50; *platea*, Ep. 2. 2. 71. Also for *sibilare* see note of Palmer on Hor. Sat. 1. 1. 66.

J. H. KIRKLAND.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature. By THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph. D., Litt. D., Professor of English in the College of New Jersey. Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1892. 384 pp.

There is an ambiguity in the title of Professor Hunt's work. We must examine the table of contents in order to ascertain what is meant by "Old English Literature." We there find that the work is divided into two parts: I, from Caedmon to Chaucer (650–1350 A. D.); and II, from Chaucer to Ascham (1350–1550 A. D.). The literature of these two periods—not all, but much of it—is described, twelve chapters being devoted to each period, and it is criticised from an ethical point of view. In accordance with modern terminology, a title more exactly descriptive of the work would be "Old and Middle English Literature, viewed from an ethical standpoint." As to the general method, suffice it to say that, after a brief description of the particular work in hand, its moral and religious tone is pointed out and illustrated. As most of the works treated are distinctively religious, this results in giving examples of their contents and in commenting upon them. But Professor Hunt takes up also some secular works, as the 'Beowulf' and Layamon's 'Brut' in the first period, and the works of Chaucer, Gower, Caxton and Ascham in the second period, and points out the moral tendency of these works even when not treating a specifically moral or religious subject. His thesis is well and sufficiently substantiated, that "Old English Literature" is marked by an ethical tone which makes it wholesome reading. At the same time it must be added that the book is not exhaustive, and works have been omitted that are companion-pieces to Chaucer's Miller's and Reeve's Tales, the moral teaching of which it would be hard to defend. However, it cannot be denied that by far the greater part of Old and Middle English literature that has come down to us is permeated by a moral and religious tone that testifies to the healthy moral nature of our English ancestors.

There is here and there throughout the work a lack of accuracy, especially in the quotations, that calls for correction. Misprints are quite numerous, but there are more serious faults, some of which will be pointed out. Among minor inaccuracies, on the first page we meet with the statement that "the three centuries from Spenser to Tennyson are more than trebled by the ten centuries from Caedmon to Spenser." It happens to be just *nine* centuries from the death of Caedmon to The Shepherd's Calendar. On p. 46, in the lines from Caedmon, we find 'guardians' for 'guardian'; on p. 47 Professor Hunt remarks: "Such coincidences may be fully accepted, and yet not be regarded as proving identity or even imitation of plan and process." While it is impossible to *prove* Milton's indebtedness to Caedmon, probability seems to me to favor it, for Milton might easily have learnt the contents of the

so-called poems of Caedmon from his friend Junius, who published the first edition of these poems in 1655, and who may have communicated to Milton their contents. I should prefer 'should' for 'would' in lines 12, 13, 14, p. 50; *gastlice*, p. 58, lacks marks of quantity ; p. 72, line 9, 'aught' should be 'aright'; p. 74, line 2, I should read 'Anglian' for 'Anglo-Danish,' as the 'Beowulf' doubtless existed in its present form before the Danes settled in England. Ettmüller calls the paraphrast, or interpolator, a "West-Saxon monk," and Professor Earle has fixed upon "Hygeberht, the man chosen by Offa to be Archbishop of Lichfield," a Mercian then, as the identical man ; p. 100, line 3, the quantity of *Scop* is now considered short; p. 110, line 6 from bottom, 599 should be 597; p. 113 we find 'Odericus Vitalus' for 'Ordericus Vitalis'; p. 20 'Arely,' p. 113 'Ernley,' p. 120 'Ernely or Arely,' and p. 123 'Areley'; consistency would require the one or the other form for each word; p. 121, 'Goeffrey' (*bis*); p. 138, in the second quotation from the Ormulum, *aere* is translated 'reverence'; it should be 'ear,' for it represents A. S. *ēare*, not *ār*: p. 139, *gg* is not a good representative of Early English ʒʒ, *yy* would be better; p. 142, lines 7 and 8, 'fourteenth' and 'thirteenth' should be 'fifteenth' and 'fourteenth'; so p. 144, line 3, 'thirteenth' should be 'fourteenth'; pp. 147–8, 'Latinic' does not seem to be an authorized word; p. 157, line 7 from bottom, 'The Ayenbite of Inwyt' is called a 'poem'; p. 170, line 11 from bottom, we find 'rythmical,' and in the stanzas from the 'Proverbs of Hendyng' (pp. 170–1) are several misprints (compare the text in Morris and Skeat, Part II) ; in the selection (pp. 176–7) it would be better to give the exact text and translate obsolete words, and to insert marks of omission between the stanzas ; in stanza 2, line 5, 'had' should be 'hath'; in stanza 5, line 3, 'when it would up swell' is not exact for 'þer hit vp swal,' and 'overall' should be translated. Some of these may seem small matters, but it is well to be accurate even in small matters.

In the first chapter of Part II Professor Hunt brings out well "the ethical spirit of Chaucer's writings," but I cannot approve the liberties taken with the text. Surely the general reader has a right to the best attainable text, even in a short quotation, and he should not be put off with a paraphrase, or translation, that utterly destroys Chaucer's exquisite rhythm. Here, too, marks of omission should show when lines are left out, and the reader should not be led to infer that he has the passage as Chaucer wrote it. It would take too long to point out the numerous instances of this injustice to Chaucer; in the extracts from 'The Former Age,' 'Truth' and the 'Parliament of Birds' (pp. 189–90), the lines are run together in such a way as to destroy all semblance of poetry. Also, when Chaucer's spelling is used, as in 'The Clerkes Tale,' etc., the apostrophe should not be written, as there is nothing omitted, and it was not used to denote the possessive case in Chaucer's day. It is time people were learning to read Chaucer's writings as he wrote them, and all attempts at modernizing the language are misdirected; it is no wonder that some people think Chaucer unrhythmical when they have to put up with paraphrases of his genuine text. In the selection on p. 193, l. 19, 'foul' does not mean 'idle,' even though spoken of a priest, and in the line following 'lewèd' is the opposite of 'learned.'

In the chapter on 'Sir John Mandeville,' Professor Hunt does not state the doubts that have been cast upon his reliability, and the later date that has

been assigned to the English version of his so-called 'Travels.' Maetzner long since showed that the same man who made the French version could not have made the English version, and the language itself is later than that of Chaucer; it shows plainly that this version could not have been made in 1356. The standard authority for the modern view of Sir John Mandeville is the article of Mr. Nicholson and Col. Yule in the Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. XV, issued ten years ago (1883). They say that "there is only a small residuum of the book to which genuine character, as containing the experiences of the author, can possibly be attributed"; and, after comparing a certain passage with its analogue: "Such a passage . . . leaves no room for the rehabilitation of Mandeville's character as regards conscious mendacity." Moreover, in confirmation of what Maetzner had already pointed out, they say, " That none of the forms of the English version can conceivably be from the same hand which wrote the original work is made patent to any critical reader by their glaring errors of translation, but the form now current asserts in the preface that it was made by Mandeville himself, and this assertion has been taken on trust by almost all modern historians of English literature." This being the case, the necessity is all the greater for correcting that assertion at every available opportunity.

But we have most fault to find with the way in which Professor Hunt has treated Langlande's great work, 'The Vision of Piers Plowman.' He says, "as it lies before us, it consists of a Prologue and seven separate sections, each under the name of a Passus." In other words, the little Clarendon Press edition of selections from the B-text has been taken as the poem. A mere examination of the Early English Text Society's edition, by Professor Skeat, or of the Clarendon Press edition in two volumes, large 8vo (1886), would have shown that the A-text consists of a Prologue and twelve Passus, the B-text of a Prologue and twenty Passus, and the C-text, the final form of the poem, of twenty-three Passus. This is one of those oversights, of which there are several in the book, that are misleading to the general reader. The quotations from this poem on pp. 254-5 also lack marks of omission, so that the inference is that the lines are consecutive, when in reality there are omissions. The exact B-text, on p. 255, lines 3, 4, is:

> " For Iames the gentil· iugged in his bokes,
>   That faith with-oute the faite· is riȝte no thinge worthi,
>   And as ded as a dore-tre· but ȝif the dedes folwe."

The A-text has here:

> " For Iames the gentel· bond hit in his book,
>   That fey withouten fait· is febelore then nouȝt,
>   And ded as a dorè-nayl· but the deede folewe";

and the C-text reads:

> " For Iamys the gentel· iuggeth in hus bokes,
>   That feith with-oute fet· ys febelere than nouht,
>   And ded as a dore-nayle· bote yf the dede folwe."

<div align="right">(C. P. 8vo ed., vol. I, pp. 36-7.)</div>

This passage is a good example of the changes often made by Langlande in the same passage in his several revisions, even when he made no additions. It is interesting to note that after using 'dore-tre,' he returned to 'dore-nayle,' in which form the proverb, even older than Langlande's work, has remained to the present day.[1]

In the passages from Gower, 'that for' should be 'for that' (p. 270); after line 3 (p. 271) two lines are omitted without any indication of the omission; in line 4 'to' should be erased; in line 6 'love' should be 'lore'; and in line 8 'what' should be 'that.' These too may seem small matters, but they show a lack of care in proof-reading and are worrying to one who wants the text as it stands in the printed editions. Pauli's text of Gower is in great need of revision, but until some editor arises to take it in hand, we shall have to use it as it stands. On p. 280, line 1, we find 'Peacock' for 'Pecock,' and on p. 299, 'Tyndale and Latimer were boys in their teens as Caxton came to the year of his death.' Caxton died about 1492 (some say 1491), when Tyndale was eight years, and Latimer one year of age. The selection from Latimer is printed continuously, although there are several omissions of passages. Also, Latimer writes 'plough' and 'ploughman,' not 'plow' and 'plowman.' John Randolph, writing in 1806, corrects his nephew for spelling 'plowing' (Letters, pp. 10 and 17). As regards the statement on p. 318, it may be noted that Tyndale began to print at Cologne, but was discovered and forced to fly to Worms, where he finished his first edition. On p. 319 we find 'Vilvond' for 'Vilvoorde,' on p. 323 'Membert' for 'Mombert,' and on p. 339 'Tully's Officers' for 'Offices.' Note also 'Roger's' (p. 349), 'Brookes' (p. 365), 'precedure' (p. 367), *sev* for *seo* (p. 376), and a few other misprints in the 'Reference List.' It is not possible to avoid misprints, and some must be condoned in every book, but this book has an unusually large number of them; they are noted for future correction.

Professor Hunt writes in an easy and interesting style, and no fault is to be found with his criticisms as such. The faults noted can easily be corrected in a future edition, and, in the opinion of the writer, the book will thereby be made more serviceable. Literary criticism should be based on philological accuracy, and oversights should be duly corrected. Professor Hunt has made plain to the general reader the pervading ethical teaching in Old and Middle English literature, and I trust his book may reach a wide circle of readers and may awaken a desire for more extended acquaintance with that literature.

<div align="right">JAMES M. GARNETT.</div>

The English Language and English Grammar, an historical study of the sources, development and analogies of the language and of the principles governing its usages, illustrated by copious examples from writers of all periods. By SAMUEL RAMSEY. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London, 1892. iv + 571 pp.

This is a comprehensive title, and had the book fulfilled its promise with like thoroughness throughout, it would have been a valuable work. As it is, the work seems to the writer a prominent illustration of the impossibility of

---

[1] Cf. Amer. Jour. of Philology, VIII 347 ff. (No. 31, Oct. 1887), for review of Langlande's work.

writing about the English language without a competent knowledge of its older periods. It is when treating these periods that the defects of the book are most plainly seen. The author writes in an easy, pointed and interesting style, and his remarks upon present usage are judicious, and can generally be concurred in, but he is not a good guide for the older language.

The work is divided into two parts, the first, of over 200 pages, treating the English Language, and the second, of over 300 pages, treating English Grammar. The subjects of the several chapters of the first part are, the instability of language, the sources of English, the province of grammar, word-making, the alphabet, Grimm's Law, and pronunciation and spelling. The second part treats the several parts of speech, and syntax, closing with some suggestions to young writers, which it would be well for young writers to follow. The weakness of the work is seen in the very first chapter, in the misprints of the specimens of Old English, especially of Caedmon's Hymn (p. 8), in which there are no less than *eight* palpable errors, besides the omission of one and a half lines at the end, which are necessary to the sense, and the hymn itself is mistranslated, *or astelidae* being rendered "from the beginning"; no regard is paid to its punctuation.

The chapter on the sources of English is very inadequate. The author has no conception of Old English phonology, or of dialectic variations. All that he has to say of *ea* and *eo* is that they were "especial favorites, in which the sounds are supposed to have been kept separate" (p. 13); he has no notion of the circumstances under which they occur. So in a list of words given to show that these words "from the Lindisfarne Gospels, A. D. 950, are nearer modern English than the Saxon of the same period," we find "Saxon *axode*, Anglian *ascade*," with no mention of the West Saxon *ascode*, weakened to Southern English *askede*; similarly "Saxon *fixas*, Anglian *fisces*," overlooking the common *fiscas*[1]; *ex uno disce omnes*. Again, p. 20, it is scarcely correct to say that "A monk named Ormin composed a long poem on the Jewish and Christian religions," when he was merely writing a poetical paraphrase of the readings in the Church service, with homiletic explanations and additions.

On p. 23 we find the wonderful statement that "The earliest English poetry depended neither on rhyme, accent, nor measure, but on alliteration." One who could make such a statement must either have no ear for *accent* or be ignorant of the earliest English poetry. Our author still puts the English version of Sir John Mandeville's 'Travels' as 1356 (p. 39), not having examined the Encyclopedia Britannica volume of 1882, where this date is duly corrected. This chapter is, however, more noticeable for its omissions than its inclusions. We have no original and thorough study of the Anglo-Saxon (Old English) basis of the language, and its successive modifications by Scandinavian, Norman-French, Latin and Greek elements. The author has made use of Professor Skeat's Etymological Dictionary, and takes some statistics of the distribution of words from it, but the 'dictionary' method is a very erroneous one for ascertaining the proportion of words of different origin in actual use. On p. 36 Mr. Ramsey gives the estimates of Hickes, Sharon Turner, Trench and Thommerel, but omits the later and better one of Hon. George P. Marsh,

---

[1] Presumably these words are taken from Matt. 14, 17, but here the Rushworth MS has *fiscas*.

although his name is mentioned on p. 27.   It may be remarked in passing that
it is not now usual to refer to the late Archbishop of Dublin as *Dean* Trench.
After some remarks on the province of grammar, which the author rightly
regards as "a purely descriptive science," the duty of the grammarian being
"to state and classify the facts as he finds them," we have a long chapter on
Word-Making.   Here, along with lists of prefixes and suffixes found in English
words, we have illustrations from Turkish, after Max Müller, and paradigms
from Semitic languages, Hebrew and Arabic, that seem out of place and might
well have been omitted.   On p. 57 the so-called "successive amputations" of
the Old English *daeghwamlīcan* are purely imaginary, and it would be difficult
to substantiate such forms as are there given : the author mixes a supposed
M. E. *dae-* with an O. E. *-līc*, and regards it as but a shortened form of the
former word : Stratmann would have helped him out here.   The Shaksperian
godigoden (R. and J. iii, 5 [not 2, as given], 173) is cited as an illustration of
the running together of a phrase into a word, but the fuller *godgigoden* (i, 2, 58),
in which the *g* is retained, is omitted ; the former may be a misprint, as the
First Folio is notoriously full of misprints.   It would be well to drop Max
Müller's comprehensive term 'Turanian' (p. 81), and not to classify Basque
with the Finno-Tataric languages merely because it is agglutinative.   (Cf.
Hovelacque, Science of Language, pp. 144–6 and 109 ff.)   On p. 87, *ad fin.*,
we find *sothe* as a preterite of *seethe*, and p. 89, *ad fin.*, the Scotch *gaed* given as
the preterite of *go*, i. e. M. E. *yode*, A. S. *ēode*, with which it has no connection.
On p. 92 we find 'Country-dance, for contra-dance,' after Webster, i. e. through
French *contredanse*.   The reverse would be more nearly correct, and Professor
Skeat states that "*country-dance* is not the same as *contredanse*."   This is an
instance of mistaken etymology.

   The chapter on The Alphabet gives some useful information as to the origin
of the characters, tracing them back to the early Greek, old Hebrew, and
Egyptian, though at somewhat disproportionate length.   The author thinks
(p. 122) that *thorn* (þ) and crossed *d* (ð) represented respectively the surd and
the sonant sounds of *th*, an erroneous notion, as these characters were used
indifferently for both sounds.   The short chapter on Grimm's Law is very
unsatisfactory, and we hear nothing of Verner's Law.   Pronunciation and
Spelling are treated at considerable length and more satisfactorily.   The
author has evidently devoted much study to these subjects, and has given us
a full treatment of them from a popular and practical point of view.   He has
made no attempt at a scientific classification of sounds, nor has he adopted the
usual key to pronunciation, as in the New English Dictionary, for example,
but a system of his own, which is easily understood, and, in general, consis-
tently carried out ; (*ai*), for instance, is used to represent the name-sound of
a, as in *fain*, *fane*, and (*ii*) the diphthongal sound of *i* in *fine*.   *Ei* (p. 156)
represented this latter sound "for more than three hundred years," says the
author ; it then passed into (*ae' ee*), and "toward the close of the seventeenth
century" into the sound (*ai*).   "The eighteenth century made the digraph
what it is now prevailingly (*ee*)," as in *deceive*.   It is hard to say what pronun-
ciation Mr. Ramsey gives to *heifer*, but it seems to be the long *e* (*ee*), as above,
and not the short *e* (*hĕf-er*), which is now more common.   It deserves to be
noted that he rightly recognizes the pronunciation of chair as *cheer*, oblige as

obleej, as correct in the last century and continued by old persons into the present century. So also of *oi* as (*ii*), *piint* for point, *jiin* for join, which may be substantiated from Pope's poetry. The writer has often heard these pronunciations from older, well-educated persons. Mr. Ramsey rightly says: "they are merely old-fashioned" (p. 166). He frequently gives provincial and colloquial pronunciations, as 'Virginian kyard, gyarden,'[1] cited (p. 152) as an instance of palatalization, which was formerly so prevalent in Old English. He has omitted, however, the colloquial *yō* for ewe; I have never heard a country farmer, even an educated man, use any other pronunciation, although the dictionaries are unanimous for *yu*. I do not think the author rightly discriminates the *i*-sounds in *fire* and *fine* (p. 161). The diphthongal *i* is, to my ear, the same in both, i. e. as in the pronoun *I* and the noun *eye*, but the former is followed by the *ə*-sound, i. e. *u* in *but*, due to the following *r*, which so often makes a dissyllable in Shakspere. But comment on sounds is infinite, and space is finite, so there must be an end to these remarks. On proper names (pp. 202–5) I may simply say that in this latitude *Le-fee'-vur* is heard for Lefevre, as well as the French pronunciation, *Mooltree* for Moultrie, *l* being retained, and *Tol-i-ver*, not *Tul-i-ver*, is the pronunciation of Taliaferro. The chapter closes with some judicious remarks on phonetic spelling, which is, however, as far off as ever, except for scientific purposes.

There is no space to comment in detail upon the second part. It may be remarked, in general, that where the author steers clear of the older language, there is little fault to find, but here, as in the first part, he is all at sea. Some of these errors will be briefly noted: on p. 239 occurs the statement: "In Anglo-Saxon *child* and *children* were alike *cild*." It should be unnecessary to state that the plural of *cild* was *cildru*, although *cild* is used as a plural in the passage cited (Matt. ii. 16). From *cildru* came M. E. *childre* and *childer*, the latter still heard in the North of England, and to these forms *n* was added in Southern English, making the double plurals *children* and *childern*, of which the former survived. On p. 242, *fít, gís, tǐ'ð* are not the plurals of *fót, gós, tǒ'ð*. The phenomena of mutation (Umlaut) do not seem to be understood by the author, and certainly *child, children* (p. 244) is not an example of it. It is certainly wrong to include *leman* with *horseman*, etc., as forming plurals in *-men* (cf. Piers Plowman, A. 3, 146 et al.). We have been saying *lemans* since the fourteenth century, though Stratmann gives *lefmen* from Robert of Gloucester, *circa* 1297. On p. 294 the paradigm of the weak (definite) declension of the A. S. *gód* is given, although the author says: "The Saxon declension took another pattern slightly fuller when the definite article preceded the adjective" (!), a singular instance of misconception. The strong (indefinite) declension had been given for *blind* under Word-Making (p. 88), where it was not needed, but it would have been in place here. On p. 310 we find *wet* for we two, and on p. 315 the first example, from 'The Soul's Ward,' is mistranslated. But I must pass over much noted for comment. On p. 352 the author shows an entire misconception of the reason for Grimm's use of the terms *strong* and *weak* to denote the Teutonic conjugations, but I have no room for quotation. As to the basis of the classification of the strong verbs he has not the most remote idea, nor of the change of vowel in the

[1] This is given as an alternative pronunciation by Cooley (1863).

preterite singular and plural. I know of no one since Chaucer who holds "that we ought to say *he sang* and *they sung*." In his list of *strong* verbs such *weak* verbs as *bleed*, *lead*, *read*, etc., are included simply because the modern preterite shortens the vowel, and even *plead*, of Norman-French origin, is inserted and furnished in due form with a preterite and participle *pled* (!), thus elevating this illiterate form to the society of the literate. But I must bring this review to a close, and cannot notice the succeeding chapters. Suffice it to say that there are many more errors when dealing with Gothic and Anglo-Saxon forms. Bosworth has supplied the quotations from the Gospels, but he is often quoted incorrectly. Gothic forms beginning with *hw* are repeatedly written *wh*, and there are other errors in Gothic words. In one short line from John xiii. 14 (p. 379) there are three errors in the Anglo-Saxon: the A. S. *sceolon* is written *sceolen*, *eower* is omitted, and *ðres* is written *others*. I am inclined to sympathize with Mr. Ramsey's hostility to the puristic rules about the use of *shall* and *will*, which are the inventions of modern English grammarians. It may be remembered that Mr. Marsh declared against them and predicted their speedy disappearance from the language: they certainly have no historical support, as every reader of the Bible can learn for himself. I must, in closing, call attention to the remarkable paradigm of *fand*, preterite of *findan*, on p. 445, and the remarks following on p. 446, and to the form *secge* for the imperative on p. 458. There are several errors in the quotations on p. 491, as a comparison with Morris and Skeat's Specimens, Part I, which has furnished them, will show. In the very first one *liefe* is written for *lufe*, and the word *musestoch* (mouse-trap) is left off, which materially affects the sense, causing the author to turn a genitive into an impossible plural. Mr. Ramsey has copiously illustrated his remarks with examples, the only correct method, but he should quote accurately, *verbatim et literatim*; otherwise, he runs the risk of gross errors. Again, on p. 498, a lack of knowledge of Anglo-Saxon has led him to turn a plural into a singular in Gen. xxxii. 11. The quotations from Chaucer also need looking after on pp. 496 and 531, for the rhythm is sadly mutilated. On p. 522 the author rightly condemns the placing of an adverb between *to* and the infinitive, but I fear it is hopeless to fight against this blunder, which is gradually becoming more and more common where least expected. He also condemns the solecism *of all others* (p. 547), which, however, was more common in the Elizabethan period than now.

If the historical part of the book could be rewritten, it would be improved: as it stands, it is a blind leader of the blind.

<div align="right">James M. Garnett.</div>

Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen. Von Dr. Peter Schmitt. Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Herausg. von M. Schanz. Band III, Heft 2. Würzburg, A. Stuber's Verlagshandlung, 1889.

The practical interest in Schmitt's book, *Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen*, which appeared in 1889, was very much lessened by the fact that soon after its publication the main results were assimilated by Professor Goodwin in his new Moods and Tenses, which came

out the following year. After the appearance of any considerable text-book there is always a tendency to call a halt, and to the ordinary student Professor Goodwin's repertory may well seem full enough to meet all reasonable demands. But for that matter the old edition seemed a satisfying portion to the run of syntacticians. Mr. Monro, for instance, in his review of the new Moods and Tenses (C. R. 1890, p. 261), said that 'with all the additions and amplifications which it has undergone, there has been nothing of importance to correct or withdraw.' Assuredly Mr. Monro has claimed for Professor Goodwin much more than Professor Goodwin himself would claim. There has been correction enough and withdrawal enough to make the new Moods and Tenses a radically different book from the original work, and it would be a pity that correction and withdrawal should cease simply because so high a standard of excellence has been attained. In looking over Schmitt's book again to see what or how much Professor Goodwin has not used, I have made a few notes, which I will produce here instead of the detailed review which I had planned when the book first fell under my eye.

The introductory chapter deals with the different ways of fusing two independent sentences, or rather λόγοι, into one. The second sentence is taken up into the first as an integral part of it, or is added to the first by means of a joint. The former construction is that of the accusative and infinitive or the participle, although it is not fair to call that a fusion which is really one to begin with, and which cannot be disintegrated without an entire change of conception. The latter construction is that of a relative sentence or equivalent. According to Schmitt the construction of the accusative and inf. is derived from the locative element of the infinitive. δύναμαι λαβεῖν is 'ich habe Kraft im Nehmen.' This is the same view that Deecke, in his recently published grammar, takes for Latin. To Deecke *audeo dicere* is 'ich bin verwegen im Behaupten,' whereas Monro prefers the dative for Greek, and ἐθέλω δόμεναι is 'I am willing for giving.' To be sure, the locative is also a whither case (cf. χαμαί = χαμᾶζε), and so we come back to the dative of the purpose, and then again the dative of the purpose brings us to the old-fashioned terminal accusative, which is the accusative of the inner object. βούλομαι ἰέναι 'ich will gehen,' 'I will go,' are all suspiciously alike in their conception. All deorganized parts of speech are neuter accusatives, and the infinitive *in vacuo*, so to speak, is an accusative of the inner object. Out of the infinitive μάχεσθαι we may conjure up an original dative 'To arms.' This is what it may have been to the prehistoric Greek, and this is certainly an easy way to get at the imperative infinitive (A. J. P. XIV 124). But what of the historical Greek? Even with our sign 'to' we cannot keep our so-called inf. to its dative work, and to the historical Greek the imperative inf. was nothing more than, for instance, *s'adresser* is to the Frenchman of to-day. If the infinitive is to live as a verb it must die as a noun. δοῦναι, whether dative by rights or locative, or both, resigns its privileges as a noun, and only gets them back by the article. τῷ δοῦναι is a dative not as τῷ δόντι is a dative, but as τῷ λάμβδα is a dative. The original dative sense of δοῦναι has withdrawn itself from the consciousness, no matter what dative habits it may have kept up in certain syntactical combinations. But what of the acc. and inf.? The acc. that goes with the inf, depended originally on the leading verb as much as

does the inf., and this Schmitt sees, though he maintains that in the course of time the consciousness that the acc. belonged to the leading clause vanished, and the accusative was felt to belong to the inf. But when does that detachment begin? So long as the acc. and inf. is an object we can hardly speak of detachment. It is only when the accusative and inf. becomes a formal subject that the trouble begins, a trouble which we need not borrow now, especially as we have a much more difficult transition in our own language, in which '*for*+ objective case + *to* w. inf.' is treated as the subject of a sentence. But not to go into matters that will carry us too far afield, let us look at the object clauses which take the acc. and inf., beginning with Homer. These clauses follow, according to Schmitt, *verba sentiendi, dicendi, cogitandi* and *verba affectus.* Of the *verba sentiendi*, ἀκούω is the only one that takes the inf. in Homer, and that only four times, according to Schmitt; five times, according to Ebeling. πυνθάνομαι is so construed once, B 119. But it would be a mistake to consider τείρεσθαι Τρῶας in ἄκουσεν τείρεσθαι Τρῶας, Z 386, 'as virtually = ὅτι ἐτείροντο Τρῶες' (Monro, H. G.² §237, 2). ἀκούω with inf. is construed after the analogy of verbs of thinking, and verbs of thinking cannot be replaced by ὅτι constructions. ἀκούω with acc. and inf. is and abides 'to think from hearsay,' as ἀκούω with acc. participle is 'to know from hearsay.' It is not a *verbum sentiendi*, but a *verbum cogitandi*. Of the verbs of saying, φημί is chief. But φημί is essentially a verb of creation. It does more than say: it declares, it avers (A. J. P. IV 56), and the inf. after it is not separated from the inf. after verbs of will by an impassable gulf. The *verba cogitandi* can have no other than the inf. construction; 'to think' is in a sense to create, and in the *verba affectus* that take the acc. and inf. the will is involved. From all this it would appear that the whole batch may be put under the dative inf., and that we must postpone the parallelism between acc. with inf. and ὅτι with the finite verb. This parallelism is not to be denied for the later times, when the opt. of *o. o.* comes in, but a large part of its domain the inf. keeps for itself, and φημί allows no intrusion, or as good as none.

As the inf. will not yield all its rights to the object sentence, so the participle refuses to give up the *verba sentiendi*, in the full sense of actual perception, to ὅ and its kind. Actual perception must have the participle, for the participle is, as I have elsewhere ventured to express it, the skin of the object. Intellectual perception may have the same construction as actual perception, but it is only in a figure, and it usually takes the separate object sentence ὅ, ὅτι and the like. This is a vital difference and assuredly not a subtle difference, and yet it seems to be extremely hard to bring it into the sphere of elementary grammar, to which it belongs. (Comp. A. J. P. XIV 103.) After verbs of emotion we have the object sentence as well as the participle— in fact, in preference to the participle—but this is not surprising, in view of the manifold play of emotion itself.

We now proceed to the proper subject of Schmitt's essay. ὅ and ὅτι of the object sentence, like the other relatives, are considered by Schmitt as originally demonstrative in their nature, and as representing syntactically the accusative of the inner object, the acc. of the object effected. Our English feeling would lead us to the classification of this accus. as the acc. of the object affected. In 'I know that my Redeemer liveth,' 'that' is hardly felt as an inner object,

even after 'knowledge' is added. But the object affected will not yield the causal meaning of *ὅ* and *ὅτι*, and it requires no stretch of ͵art to elicit the object affected from the object effected, the outer object from the inner. Indeed, Schmitt himself is evidently inclined to consider the inner object as the original use of the acc., although he is afraid to go so far as Erdmann (Ueb. die Syntax Otfrids, Halle, 1874, p. 76.) whom he cites as the originator of the view. Let us read what Bernhardy says (Wissenschaftliche Syntax, Berlin, 1829, p. 105): "Der Accusativus stellt das Objekt dar, *den Inhalt und das Moment des Verbums*, und zwar zuerst als ein absolutes oder unmittelbares Objekt, die reine Wirkung und an sich betrachtet, u. s. w.," seven years before Trendelenburg rediscovered the meaning of the Greek *αἰτιατική*. All this wisdom is as old as the nomenclature of the cases (cf. A. J. P. II 89).

This acc. of the inner object, *ὅ* or *ὅτι*, appears in various categories which I cannot undertake to pursue here. Suffice it to notice that Schmitt gets himself tangled up in relative and dependent interrogative, and calls *ὁπποίης* (*a* 171) a direct interrogative, though the dependence was clearly shown years and years ago by grammarians and commentators. This form of the dependent sentence, it may further be observed, has very little hold in Homer on verbs of saying. It was not until the optative was developed as the *oratio obliqua* form of the indic. that *ὅτι* could have a wide sweep; and that phase was not reached in Homer, as was pointed out many years ago. Comp. Tr. Am. Phil. Ass. 1878, p. 9, and A. J. P. IV 419, where it is shown that Delbrück stopped short in his analysis. *εἰπεῖν ὅτι*, on which there is still so much pedantical insistence (in spite of A. J. P. IV 88, VI 489; Humphreys on So. Antig. 647), has but two examples in all Homer, P 655, *π* 131 ; whereas *εἰπεῖν* 'say' has, according to Ebeling, three with the inf., N 666, Σ 9, Ω 113, and even if we leave out N 666, where the tenses show something of prophetic strain, Homeric honors are easy. No one would advise the writing of *εἰπεῖν* 'say' with inf. in a Greek exercise; but it is not bad Greek, nor even odd Greek.

Much space is given by Schmitt to the discussion of *ὅτε* as an introductory particle to the object clauses. Is it merely the accusative of the inner object to *ὅστε*, or has it already differentiated itself as a temporal particle corresponding to *τότε*? Schmitt decides for the latter view, and thinks that the temporal sense has simply been weakened, just as he considers the 'how' sense of *ὡς* to have been so weakened as often to be indistinguishable from *ὅτι*. But there are passages enough of Greek in which the 'how' sense of *ὡς* is absolutely necessary, a fact which one would not gather from L. and S.'s article on *ὡς*. So, f. i., Andok. 2, 14; Isokr. 2, 3 ; 3, 10; 16, 11. 15; Aischin. 2, 35 ; D. 24, 139. Now, so long as such passages are found, it is idle to maintain that there is ever an absolute indifference to the use now of *ὡς* and now of *ὅτι*. Some authors may be more scrupulous than others. Some authors may be more scrupulous at one time of life than at another. *δῆλον ὡς* ought to produce a 'crawly' sensation in a Hellenist, and it does produce a crawly sensation when we find that Plato uses it 14 times in the Laws, against 16 times of the normal *δῆλον ὅτι* (A. J. P. X 472 ; cf. XII 497, bottom).

As I said (A. J. P. VI 487), 'that' and 'how' are in a sense interchangeable, in a sense they are not, as any one who is familiar with English narrative knows. The classic 'how that,' the vulgar and dialectic 'as' and 'as how,'

bring directly to our feeling ὅτι and ὡς, and ὡς may be translated 'how' in very many passages of Greek where it is mechanically rendered 'that.'[1] A certain deadening has taken place, but my collections show only one passage in which the deadening has gone so far as to make a difference between ὡς and πῶς possible. We read, [Dem.] 32, 4: αὐτὸς ἔγραψεν ἐν τῷ ἐγκλήματι ὡς ἐν τῷ πελάγει ἀπώλετο (π ῶ ς δ' οὐ προσέγραψεν ἀλλ' ἐγὼ φράσω).

A similar deadening is noticed by Schmitt in regard to οὕνεκα, which fades out to 'that' just as διότι declines to a mere ὅτι.

The second paper of Schmitt's essay treats of the shift of person necessitated by indirect discourse. In Homer the tenses do not shift. Verbs of saying and verbs of showing are on a different plane, but of this Homer recks not. They have alike the construction of the independent sentence. There is no *repraesentatio*, as there is no *oratio obliqua* opt. in Homer, except for the interrogative sentence.

How much of this will be new to the student, how much an old story, may be gathered from the hints already given in this survey. Every one who has had anything to do with syntactical study knows how much of it is rediscovery, how much reminiscence.

<div align="right">B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.</div>

---

[1] If Professor Goodwin had followed the advice given in the passage cited above, and read Coleridge's ' Love,' he would have thought twice before he committed himself to the statement that 'how' for 'that' is vulgar.

REPORTS.

A. L. Stiefel, " Ueber die Quellen der Hans Sachsischen Dramen." It must
be exceedingly satisfactory to the lovers of Hans Sachs to notice the rapidly
increasing interest in the master of master-singers, who, as late as the beginning
of this century, was stigmatized by a noted German critic as " artisan even in
poetry." Unboundedly popular in his own age, he was thrown aside in the
succeeding centuries, when foreign literature had corrupted the nation's taste.
Again brought forward, he has steadily grown in interest during the last six
decades, till it never was so great or so intelligent as at the present day.
Stiefel's paper, originally a lecture delivered in 1882 before the Historical
Society of Nürnberg, must, even at this date, prove of use to the student of the
German drama, owing to the extensive researches then made by the author
into the origin of many of the " Fastnachtspiele" of Hans Sachs, and the
absence of anything like a complete collection of the entire material. Eighty-
five carnival plays are discussed by Stiefel as to their origin, date and relation
to the works of other poets.

K. Maurer's paper, " Ueber Ari Frodi und seine Schriften," chiefly treats of
the historical works of Are, the father of Icelandic historiography (1067–1148).
Of the Islendinga-bók, Are wrote two recensions. The older, dedicated to
the bishops Þorlak and Ketill, which contained the genealogies and lives of
kings, is lost ; but the second recension, revised upon the advice of the bishops
and brought out about the year 1130, is preserved. Maurer gives us the result
of much reading on the subject, and has in some cases new and valuable
suggestions to make. He differs from Gudbrand Vigfusson, who maintained
that the book of Kings and the book of Settlement (embodied in Snorre's
work) were earlier productions of Are, which he inserted later in his first
recension of the Islendinga-bók. Maurer thinks that the knowledge we have
of the contents and shape of the older recension of the Isldgb. clearly points
to a first attempt of Are in authorship. Besides, he exclaims, what on earth
could have prompted the historian, who was sensible enough to treat a
history of Norwegian kings, and again the settlement of Iceland, in separate
works, to insert these books afterwards in a history of Iceland which ran
all the worse for the insertion, calling forth a protest from the bishops (the
learned Saemund included) which caused him to revise his book. Much
may be said for the opposite view held by Gjessing and Björn Olsen—namely,
that Are wrote the history of the kings and the settlement of Iceland after
his second recension of the Islendinga-bók. But even this theory, reasonable
enough at first sight, is open to two serious objections from the very outset.
In the first place, is it conceivable that the aged historian, who, after the

revision of his Isldgb., was past 67 years of age, should have commenced and
finished two such voluminous works as the Landnama and Konungabok are
supposed to have been, and that at a time when authorship in the native
language had just commenced and must have been exceedingly laborious? In
the next place, does not the author of the Heimskringla (Snorri) specially refer
in his prologue to a work of Are as the main source from which he drew his
information, which must have been the Islendinga-bók, as Björn Olsen
expressly admits (Aarböger, pp. 369–70)? After an exhaustive review of the
opinions of Vigfusson, Olsen, Brenner and others on the subject, Maurer
comes to the conclusion that Snorre's history of the kings and other versions
of the Konungabok may all point to a common original, yet this original is
not necessarily a work of Are. If the author of the prologue (Heimskringla)
mentions Are's older Islendinga-bók as the oldest work of native histori-
ography, it certainly would not exclude that author's use of other sources then
existing. In point of fact, he refers to songs and poems of different times as
sources. That Snorre based his entire history of the kings, which in its whole
conception stands in such a strong contrast to the short, dry Islendinga-bók,
upon a work of Are is not probable. As to the Landnamabok, Maurer agrees,
in the main, with Oscar Brenner, who holds that the much-enlarged version
that has come to us has its shorter original in the first and lost recension of
Are's Islendinga-bók.

Under the head of Literature, Bechstein reviews L. Wirth's book, "Die
Oster- und Passionsspiele bis zum XVI. Jahrhundert" (Halle a. S., 1889), and
pronounces it a valuable contribution to the history of the mediaeval drama in
Germany. Its chief value, however, seems to be of a philological nature.

"Zur Beurtheilung von Jacob Grimm's Ansicht über das grammatische
Geschlecht," by Victor Michels. The author passes in review the arguments
brought in defence of Grimm's theory of the grammatical gender by Gustav
Boethe in the preface of the reprint of the 3d vol. of Grimm's grammar, and
concludes, with Brugmann and others, that the magnificent poetic insight
which the Grimm theory has attributed to our remote forefathers in the
founding of the grammatical gender fails to satisfy all the facts. The problem
is far from having received a satisfactory solution, but may find it in the
history of ancient and existing aboriginal society, to which the problem is
evidently closely related. "Wir dürfen hoffen," Victor Michels exclaims,
"dass sich die heutige Forschungen in richtigen Bahnen bewegt, wenn sie das
Bekannte zum Ausgangspunkt nimmt und es auf das Unbekannte nicht
kritiklos überträgt, aber zur Erkenntnis anwendet, das Gegenwärtige auf das
Vergangene, das Lebendige auf das Tote. Es giebt keinen anderen Weg, zur
Erkenntnis."

G. Ehrismann discusses the forms *liuzil, lutzil—leitils*, where Paul (Beitr. VI
244) suggested epenthesis. Paul's view, however, would not explain Got. *lita*
(dissimilation) by the side of *liuts* (hypocritical), and we are obliged, after all,
to consider two separate Germanic roots, *leit* and *leut*. The relation of *liut*
(*il*), etc., to *leits* is probably the following: In the one adjective (*liut*) the idea
of *little* prevailed, which later also passed over to the phonetically similar
adjective of the other root. *Liuzil* and *lutzil* stand in ablaut relation; the

suffix -*il* (diminutive) became attached later (cf. μικκύλος). The simple adjective (mittelstufige Wurzel) is Got. *luits* (*ljotr*), Cotton. V 1782 *liut*, and may therefore also be assumed for the Old High German. O. H. G. *liuzil* shows in nearly all cases the dental affricate and not the spirant. Isidor writes *z*, and not *zss*, Teg. Gl. *tz*, Mons. Fragm. c. This affricate came in from *lutzil*. Isidor's spelling *yu* may have caused the fluctuating between *liuzil, lutzil* and the form *liutzil* produced by analogy.

"Zur Declination der Alt-H. D. Abstracta," by M. H. Jellinek. The O. H. G. adjectival and verbal abstract nouns have entirely fallen together in their inflection. In all cases of the sing. and in the nom. and acc. plural they exhibit but two forms. They either end in -*i* or -*in*. Jellinek advocates a third form -*în*. The reason of a change from the older nom. *Kuningin*, acc. *Kuninginna*, to the later *Küneginne—Küneginne* is clear enough, but why the *i* of *Kuningin* should have become long in M. H. G. (*Kunigîn*) is not understood. It is likewise not fully explained why the *injo*-stems should take the ending -*i* instead of -*in*, or retain the -*in* throughout the sing. and nom. acc. plural. Braune (A. H. D. Gram. §213, note 3) suggests: "Vielleicht sind dieselben durch die Vermischung mit den Abstractis schon früher mit langem *î* anzusetzen (*burdîn*, etc.) und könnten dann ihrerseits für die M. H. D. -*în* der movierten Feminina das Modell abgegeben haben." But, says Jellinek, this would still leave the question open: Where could the *injo*-stems have mixed when their respective paradigm had no point of contact whatever? Everything, however, becomes clear, the writer continues, if we accept an ending -*în* for the abstracts also. A declension like *burdin* with -*in* in the sing. and nom. acc. plural is now explained. If we consider, further, that by the side of the forms in -*in* we find equivalents in -*i* and -*în* (*managîn, managî, managîn*), it will be seen how such double forms as *burdin—burdî, Kuningin— Kuningîn*, originated. In answer to the question whether forms in -*în* with abstracts are really possible and conceivable, Jellinek writes: "Bei der Seltenheit von Längebezeichnungen in A. H. D. Handschriften ist es ohne weiteres gestattet, die Endung -*in* der Abstr. als -*în* und als -*în* aufzufassen." Cf. Streitberg, Beitr. XIV 203 ff.

In a lengthy article entitled "Zur Metrik der altsächsischen und althochdeutschen Alliterationsverses," H. Hirt comments on the various examinations into the construction of the alliterative verse in the Heliand and the Old High German fragments. While paying tribute to the acumen and painstaking labor of Sievers, Kaufmann and others in the investigation of this question, he differs from them as regards the type-theory and some other points. Sievers, in addition to furnishing a large mass of facts, also advances the hypothesis that the short line consists of four members, of which two bear the chief accent, and that these members may combine in different ways, resulting in five types. Only that hypothesis can be the correct one, says Hirt, which fully explains all facts, and Sievers' theory does not. "Ich glaube sie gefunden zu haben," he continues, "indem ich für die normalen Typen einen dreitaktigen Vers zu Grunde lege und dabei das Princip der Synkope der Senkung anwende" (—x—x—, with syncope of thesis, ——x—), and then proceeds to apply this principle to a large number of verses, representing different types, from the Heliand and O. H. G. alliterative poetry.

Copious references to the Ags. Beowulf, the Otfried and Nibelungenvers accompany his arguments.   In the course of his investigations he shows that the forming of the thesis in the Heliand is by no means irregular, but subject to fixed laws, and where extra syllables cannot be brought under these laws they must be removed from the verse either by elision, adoption of shorter forms or textual emendation.   In the estimate of the value of the O. H. G. alliterative fragments Hirt dissents from Sievers, who holds that in disarrangement of form they have even gone a step beyond the Heliand.   This, H. thinks, is not borne out by facts.   While they show the alliteration in a process of decay, they have preserved the metrical form, and meet in this respect all demands, without subjecting them to much textual emendation. In speaking of the versification of the *Krist* he says: " The origin of Otfrid's rhymed verse is fairly clear.   He based it upon the verse of the Latin church-hymns, but substituted for its iambics the Teutonic four accents, besides employing the most important features of the alliterative poetry."   Hirt promises a paper on the development of the Middle High German epic verse of seven accents from the older long line.

As a contribution to our knowledge of the literature of the Thirty-Years War, F. W. E. Roth prints some German-Latin poems lately found by him while examining some *Rheingau* deeds.   They are written on paper, by a scribe of the XVIIth century, and entitled " Paucketum Leopoldinum, Benedictio catholischen Essens, Alia benedictio."

L. Fränkel's paper, " Bemerkungen zur Entwicklung des *Grobianismus*," furnishes more material to supplement the existing works on the subject, especially that of A. Hauffen, " Caspar Scheidt, der Lehrer Fischarts." Studien zur Geschichte der grobianischen Literatur in Deutschland (Strassburg, Trübner, 1889).   Hauffen's book is valuable as an exemplification of the polemical temper of the period of the Reformation, and illustrates the license and personality of the invectives published in those times.

R. Sprenger, " Zu Reinke Vos," suggests the following emendations: 1. In the gloss 111, 14 (Prien's edition, p. 195), the sentence occurs " Dat ander is, dat ein richter vaken wert bedrogen, umme dat he sik vorhopet, wes to krygen kleynöde edder andere *dult bottere*," etc.   Prien translates *dult bottere*, 'ein Krug oder sonst eine Quantität Butter.'   Sprenger reads: " Kleynöde edder andere dult, buttere," etc., and translates: " Kleinode und andere Geschenke, Butter," etc.   *Dult*, according to Schmeller, = 'fair' (Jahrmarkt), later often developed into the meaning of 'present' (Geschenk) bought at a fair for relations or friends.

2. " Zu Reinhart Fuchs," edition of Reissenberger, V 141.

> " Schanteclêr was ungerne dô,
>   als er im *entleip*, dô want er sâ
>   vrô
>   den hals ûz Reinhartes munde."

entleip was substituted by Schönbach for *entweich* of the MS.   As *entwichen* may also mean 'to yield to entreaty, advice' (cf. Haupt, Erec, 2, 3831), Sprenger sees no good reason for the change.   Comp. Chaucer's ' The Nonne Prestes Tale,' V 584, Morris ed. (Clarendon Press, 1883).

A. Bartsch publishes three acrostics of the 13th and 15th centuries, with notes, and R. Köhler supplies a Coptic variant of the legend "Gregorius auf dem Stein," which he found in a French translation in the Contes et Romans de l'Egypte chrétienne, par E. Amélineau, Paris, 1888; 1, 165–89. The variant is entitled "Histoire du roi Arménien," and treats of the pious king Armenios of Tyros; the real hero, however, is Johannes, the son and successor of Armenios. M. Amélineau does not seem to be acquainted with the Gregorius legend, for he says, p. 20: "L'auteur de l'histoire d'Armenios connaissait sans doute le mythe d'*Oedipe*."

O. Behaghel, the editor of the Germania, "Zu Hans von Bühel," reviews the opinions of Fritz Seelig (Strassburger Studien, III 243) regarding the language and home of the author of 'Diocletian' and 'Königstochter von Frankreich.' Seelig holds that the language bears a distinctly Alsatian character, exhibiting peculiarities which to this day characterize the dialect of Alsace. 1. The ready change from *â* to *ô*. 2. The rounding of *e* to *ö*. 3. The prevalence of *ü* (short and long) in place of *u* and *uo*. Behaghel takes exception to all three points: 1. The change from *â* to *ô* is not restricted to Alsace, as is well known (Weinhold, M. H. G. Gram. §§88, 90). 2. Seelig's examples to show change of *e* to *ö* are either not made sure by the rhyme or prove nothing; besides, they are not exclusively Alsatian. 3. *ü* for *u* and *uo* is simply wrong; the Upper-German has preserved the old diphthongs, and Seelig mistakes the orthography of the scribe for the language of the poet. Seelig places the home of the poet at a place in the district of Saarburg, near the boundary-line between the South Frankish and Alsatian dialects. A family of *von Bühel* residing at any time in that neighborhood, he has, however, not been able to trace. After a careful re-examination of the texts as to inflection and rhyme, Behaghel concludes that, while the language belongs to the Alemanic dialect, perhaps the Lower-Alemanic of Alsace and Baden, it does not settle the question as to the author's home. To say that he was an Alsatian is utterly without proof. We will have to call the records of South Germany to our aid. The family name *von Bühel* is not rare. It is found in the registers of Bavaria, Würtemberg and Switzerland. In Alsace it only occurs in the first decades of the 12th century, and later no more, but in the present Baden the von Bühels can be traced through several centuries as residing in the neighborhood of Rastatt, and it is very probable that our poet Hans von Bühel belonged to that family and had his home among them.

A. Bartsch publishes in full a fragment of Hans von Bühele's 'Königstochter,' which was found attached to the cover of some sheet music in the city library of Breslau. The fragment, written on paper, belongs to the XVth century, and proves conclusively that the text upon which the Grüninger edition is based was not the original, and, moreover, contrary to Seelig's statement, not a good one. Bartsch collates the fragment-text with the editions extant and adds critical notes.

Otto Behaghel, in a minor communication, "Zu Wolframs Liedern," verifies a proposed emendation in verse xii, 16 (Germania, 34, 489), by consulting the MS anew; and R. Bechstein gives an account of the transactions of a literary club in Rostock, Mecklenburg, devoted to the reading and translating of the masterpieces in the Low-Germanic literature of Germany. The members are

prominent historians, philologists and jurists. Some time ago it was proposed to take up a Middle High German poet for a change, and Walther v. d. Vogelweide was chosen. An outcome of this step was a popular essay on the poet, of unquestionable merit, from the pen of one of the members, Dr. Karl Koppmann, the historian. It appeared in the *Rostocker Zeitung*, 1890, Nr. 285, 297 and 309.

F. W. E. Roth sends "Mittheilungen aus mittelhochdeutschen Handschriften." The paper calls attention to some MSS of the XVIth century in the Royal Library of Wiesbaden which contain M. H. G. matter. R. prints from them part of a rhymed astrological treatise and a written continuation of a printed 'Ortulus anime.' A religious song, 'Der Meister der Blumen,' first published by Mone (Anzeiger, VIII) and Mittler (Deutsche Volkslieder) from a modern and corrupted text, but now given by R. from a better MS, closes the article. The last MS, obtained from a convent on the Rhine, formerly belonged to Roth, and is now in possession of a gentleman in America.

R. Schmidt publishes a newly discovered fragment of a "German Cato." The name "German Cato" is applied to the German translations of a collection of Latin moral maxims that had their origin in post-classical time and were attributed to a certain Dionysius Cato. They were quite popular in the Middle Ages and often commented upon, especially by the clergy, who found them an exhaustless source to draw from for their sermons. Schmidt found the German fragment in a printed Latin copy of 1475. The original possessor of this book was one Bartholomew Mulich (1480), curate at Obereichstädt, Bavaria, from whose pen the translation no doubt emanated. R. Schmidt adds a minor communication, "Alte Ergänzungen des Alphabets," which treats of certain abbreviations used by the older printers in their texts.

L. Fränkel, "Zum Proteusmärchen und anderen wandernden Stoffen," sends more material to supplement the late Dr. Liebrecht's article on folk-lore, in the Germania, 24, 129. Noteworthy is an Egyptian story, recorded at the time of the 13th dynasty (1900 B. C.), which bears some relation to the Proteus tales, and which is contained in a papyrus belonging to the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg (cf. F. Wönig, Uralte Märchen, Leipz. Tageblatt, Dec. 1888). It runs as follows: A large ship from Egypt is wrecked in a storm. The master clings to some spars and drifts about on the ocean for several days, when he is thrown upon the shore of an island, where the ruler, a wizard, in the shape of an enormous serpent, receives him kindly. The Egyptian spends some happy months on this enchanted island, and when he leaves, laden with rich presents, he is told that the island will disappear again after his departure. He reaches the shores of the Nile in safety. Fränkel adds: "Dieser Schluss, sowie manche einzelne Züge, scheinen auch anzudeuten, dass wir hier den Ausgang zu der noch immer nicht aufgefundenen Quelle von Shakespeares 'Tempest' vor uns haben."

A. Socin, "Zu den Schweizer Minnesängern" (cf. Am. Jour. of Philology, vol. XII, 4, p. 513), contributes some notes on the minstrels Pfeffel, Göli, Steinmar, Heinrich v. Tettingen, Teschler and Zem Turne, and G. Ehrismann further comments on the third 'Paulinzeller Rennerbruchstück' described by Prof. Einert in vol. 32 of the Germania.

L. Schmidt severely criticises the book 'Arminius und Siegfried,' by Jelling-haus (Leipzig, Lipsius u. Tischer). He calls it a *réchauffé* of the old worn-out hypothesis that identifies the hero of the Nibelungenlied with the conqueror of the legions of Varus. Schmidt thinks the author of the book has not even consulted the proper literature pertinent to the question, but has drawn his principal information from the writings of G. A. Schierenberg (Der Ariadne-faden für das Labyrinth der Edda, etc.).

Minor communications from A. Steiff, O. Grillnberger and G. Ehrismann close the third number.

B. Kahle's paper, "Aus isländischer Volksüberlieferung," deals with a number of Icelandic popular stories and their variants in the folk-lore of Germany and other lands (Arnasons islenzkar þjoþsögur, etc.). Some, in spite of divergences in detail, bear a striking resemblance to the Leonoresage, while others, like the story of Geirlaug and Graeðari, show their connection with the well-known and widely-scattered 'Märchen' of the two children who are pursued by a wizard but manage to escape by continually changing their form. The Japanese tale of the lover and bride who throw behind them in their flight a variety of objects which change into delicious fruit, bamboo buds, a river, etc., thereby hindering the pursuers, seems to belong to the same cycle of stories. The story 'Systurnar á Kirkjubae' has its parallel in Boccaccio's Decamerone (2d, 9th day), and 'Bóndadaeturnar' is related to Grimm's 'De drei Vügelkens' (No. 96).

A. Schlossar, "Volksmeinung und Volksaberglaube aus der deutschen Steiermark," gathers a mass of sayings, superstitions and customs current with the country people of Styria. The collection exhibits most surprising parallels to the usages and superstitions among other races, even among those that have had little, if any, intercourse with Europeans.

The chapter 'Litteratur' offers an exhaustive review, by Hermann Fischer, of Dr. Friedrich Kauffmann's book, 'Geschichte der schwäbischen Mundart im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit' (Strassburg, Trübner, 1890). K.'s book, unlike other modern works on the subject, is not merely a monograph on a limited local dialect, but a history of a widely scattered speech, and the writer has executed his task successfully. "Das Buch," says Fischer, "ist ein Werk von bedeutender Arbeits- und Denkkraft; es konnte bei dem Stande unseres Materiales nicht fehlerfrei ausfallen, aber es wird auf lange hinein befruch-tend wirken, und wir alle, die wir uns mit Sprachgeschichte oder Erforschung moderner Dialecte befassen, haben ihm für sein Unternehmen aufrichtigen Dank zu sagen."

Dr. Ehrismann's list of publications on the field of Germanic languages and literature for 1887 closes the thirty-sixth volume.

The thirty-seventh volume opens with an article entitled "Kritische Bemerkungen zum Waltharius," by Herm. Althof. A hundred years ago Ekkehard's 'Waltharius manu fortis' was considered barbarous. In harmony with a later and clearer comprehension of the epic, it has made its way to the esteem in which it is held at present. Linning, its latest editor, goes so far as

to maintain that the poem surpasses in artistic value anything we possess of the heroic saga, the Nibelungenlied not excepted. Such poets and scholars as Schwab, Scheffel and Simrock gave fresh interest to the poem and made it accessible to the general reader by divesting it of its Latin garb; it may, however, be questioned whether the rhymed Nibelungen-strophe, chosen by the translators for their renditions, was the best form to choose. It frequently involved violence to the text; now shortened, then enlarged again, it presents recasts rather than translations. "Wenn aber der Waltharius, in deutsches Gewand gekleidet, eine Stelle in unserer Litteratur finden soll," says Althof, "so ist es wünschenswert, dass nicht lediglich der poetische Inhalt der Dichtung zum Ausdruck komme, sondern dass überhaupt möglichst die Gestalt gewahrt bleibe, welche der Dichter des zehnten Jahrhunderts seinem Werke zu verleihen für gut befunden hat," and this form, the writer thinks, should be the hexameters of the original. There have, indeed, been published two translations in hexameters before, one by Klemm in 1827, and another by San Marte in 1853, but these versions have now become somewhat obsolete. A new translation, closely following the Ekkehard text and thoroughly up to date in point of research, would be desirable—and such a one Althof is about to give to us. A new edition of the original text, with notes, is to appear shortly. Among the points discussed in Althof's article are the different MSS, their relation and respective value; the translations of certain passages in the epic that have been made by other editors and those suggested by the author; the relation of the Waltharius to the Old English Waldere's Lay and the Nibelungenlied (cf. The Saga of Walther of Aquitaine, by M. D. Learned, Ph. D.: Pubs. of Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America, VII, No. 1, 1889).

F. Lauchert publishes a "Strassburger Bruchstück des Wilhelm von Oesterreich" in possession of the library of the University of Strassburg. It belongs to the 14th century, and, to judge from the vowels, is of Middle German origin. Lauchert collated the Gotha MS with it, and now prints the important variants underneath the text. The value of this Strassburg MS to textual criticism cannot be determined as yet.

K. Borinsky contributes an older German version of the Robert le Diable legend of the 15th century and some suggestive remarks on its affinity with the Romance saga; and F. W. Roth sends a communication regarding Hademar von Laber (1244–77), the author of the allegorical work entitled 'Die Jagd,' and prints some religious poems and folk-songs of the XVth and XVIth centuries from folios in the Wiesbaden and Mainz city libraries.

Friedr. Weidling, "Zum Ezzoleich." Since the first publication of Ezzo's 'Cantilena de miraculis Christi' by Diemer, forty-two years have gone by, and still the question concerning the authorship and origin of the poem seems to be an open one, although it has been more than once carefully investigated by some of the foremost Germanists of to-day. This unsettled question, and other points connected with the poem, are again discussed by Weidling in his paper. In the main he follows Willmanns (Ezzos Gesang von den Wundern Christi, Bonn Progr. 1887). The record of the author and origin of the song as given in the first strophe of the Vorau MS, W. considers authentic. Bishop

Gunther, of Bamberg, caused it to be composed for a certain occasion—the founding and presentation to his clergy of the St. Gangolph monastery—the most important act of his life. The year of the founding (1063) fairly agrees with the record as given by the Vita Altmanni (1065). Bishop Gunther commissioned the clergy of his diocese to write the *leich*, and they, in turn, left it to Ezzo to compose. This first MS began with the words "Nu will ich iu herron," and was set to music by the priest Willo. In this form it was executed, probably by Ezzo himself, on the day of dedication. After this ceremony, those persons entered who were ready to take orders in the new cloister:

> " Duo er die wîse gewan
> Sich îlten alle *munechan*."

The objection to the word *munechan* was overcome by Willmanns. The poet probably chose this word for the final exercise in preference to a strictly ecclesiastical term, as being to the point and more intelligible to every one. The song soon became a favorite with the Bamberg clergy of that time, and may have been sung often by them while on their way to and from the Crusade (1065). Ezzo, or one of his fellow-priests, no doubt made a copy of the first MS, and prefaced this copy with an introductory strophe that explained to such readers as were not in Bamberg at the time, the circumstances under which the poem had been written.

Paul Hagen sends two papers entitled "Parzivalstudien." The first reviews Lachmann's theory that Wolfram, in the fifth book and following, divided his Parzival into sections of 30 lines each, often without regard to termination of argument in the section. San Marte (Ueber W. v. E. Rittergedicht Wilhelm von Orange, Leipzig, 1871) and Bartsch (Edit., p. xix) discussed this question before, and differed entirely with Lachmann. Hagen, after summing up his own arguments, concludes: "Wenn wir auch Lachmann darin nicht beistimmen können, dass Wolfram in Absätzen von 30 Zeilen gedichtet hat, die keine Sinnesabschnitte sind, so glauben wir doch andererseits die Thatsache anerkennen zu müssen, dass *mitunter* Wolfram allerdings in 30 Versen, also auf einer Seite oder Spalte etwas Zusammengehöriges abgeschlossen hat." The second paper of Paul Hagen is chiefly taken up with criticism of the efforts of Golther (Münchener Sitzungsberichte, 1890, II) and others, that would make the Welsh tale of Peredur ab Efrawc, in the Mabinogion, a more or less direct reproduction of the Conte du graal. Nutt (Studies on the legend of the Holy Grail, London, 1888) thinks that the author of the Mabinogion combined and embellished a Welsh original with episodes from Chrestien's work and other sources, while Gaston Paris (Romania, X, XII ; Hist. litt. XXX) believes that an Anglo-Norman romance based upon shorter Keltic narratives formed the common source for both Chrestien and the Mabinogion. Hagen, after going over the ground once more, accepts the theory of a common source for both. This original version was probably a French compilation of separate stories current among the Amoricans of Brittany. It may be supposed that the French versifiers, particularly after the Grail legend became connected with the Arthursaga, made intentional changes for the sake of adornment much oftener than the Cymric narrator of the Peredur, whose

interest was simply in the story, without perhaps a thought to the artistic. It is possible, therefore, that the common source, in all essential points, is contained in the Peredur, and that the contradictions and inaccuracies which occur in the course of the story are consequent to its peculiar origin.

G. Ehrismann, in his "Kleinigkeiten," discusses the formation and meaning of some older German words. We note the compounds *himmelstelle* = 'Gerichtsstelle auf einer Bergeshöhe,' *stelboum* = 'Leuchter, Candelaber,' and the phrase *so egih guot* (Notker) = 'um mich richtig (deutlich) auszudrücken' ('to be explicit,' etc.).

"Im Streit um den Streit der drei Brüder," by Siegfried Szamatólski, is principally directed against L. Fränkel and A. L. Stiefel (cf. A. J. of Phil., vol. 36, report on Germania). The author of this paper published some time ago an article (V. f. Lit. Gesch. 2, 90–7) entitled "Beroaldus-Franck als Quelle für Hans Sachs," in which he traced the development of the fable 'Streit der drei Brüder' from the 15th to the 17th century, and proved, above all, as he thinks, its descent in the order of Beroaldus—Franck—Sachs. While he was satisfied to characterize the 'Streit' as simply an expression of contempt and ridicule of some clever humanist for scholasticism, L. Fränkel (Zs. f. Volkskunde, II) drags into the discussion all sorts of mediaeval 'Streitpoesie,' the Provençal included, and seeks to class the fable with that group. "Der zu Grunde liegende Gedanke ist nachgewiesenermassen uralt volksthümlich," Fränkel exclaims. Szamatólski, in his answers, is not over-complimentary (Stiefel comes in for a share), and frequently inveighs too sweepingly against the criticism of scholars who happen to differ with him upon this question.

M. Poeck gives varied information on "Lüneburger Haide" village customs, superstitions, sayings, etc., for averting misfortune, diseases, etc., and Fr. Grimme writes "Ueber die Heimat des Minnesängers Wachsmuot" and "Vornamenlose Minnesänger." The investigations into the home and history of the family of the minstrel Wachsmuot von Künzingen are many and various, but up to the present no satisfactory conclusions have been reached. The position of the poet in MS *c*, between the Austrian von Sachsendorf and the Rhinelander Wilh. v. Heinzenberg, gives us no clue. The name as given in the MS might point to the river Kinzig, a tributary of the Rhine, in the Black Forest valley, if a single name at all like it could be found among the noble families of this region, a region singularly rich in family records. Subsequent conjectures have likewise not amounted to more than a bare possibility. In the 23d vol. of the 'Publications de la Section Historique de l'Institut R. D. G. de Luxembourg' and M. Blanchard's 'Manuscrit généalogique' of noble families in Luxemburg, Grimme has lately discovered a family *von Küntzig* in the present Clemency (Grand-duchy of Luxemburg), near the French frontier, whose escutcheon very nearly corresponds to that of the minstrel in MS *c*. It is more than probable that this was Wachsmuot's family, and that Luxemburg was his home. But, says Grimme, "Gewissheit können wir erst erhalten, wenn der Minnesänger selbst in Luxemburgischen Urkunden nachgewiesen ist."— Continuing a former contribution, "Nachträge zu Karl Bartsch's Schweizer Minnesängern" (cf. Am. Jour. of Phil. XII, p. 513), Grimme gives us addi-

tional information about the minstrels Goeli, der Dürner, der Püller, der Schenk von Limburg, von Stamheim and der Kanzler, who all appear in the MSS without their Christian name.

R. Sprenger suggests emendations. We note the following: Arme Heinrich. L. 390:

> und was daz doch unmügelich,
> wan ich hete *muotwillen* gar,
> dô nam ich sîn vil kleine war

for

> und was daz doch unmügelich,
> wan ich enhate *nicht gar.*—(Wackernagel.)

Sprenger accordingly translates: 'Weil ich gänzlich bösen Willen hatte, so nahm ich auf Gott keine Rücksicht' (391-2).

L. 1183:

> und beslôz *in vor der tür*
> und warf einen rigel für:

for

> und beslôz *im vor die tür.*—(Lachmann.)

L. 1284:

> sî brach ir zuht unde ir site:
> sî *zarte* unde roufte sich

for .

> sî brach . . .
> sî *gram* unde roufte sich.—(Wackernagel.)

Ulrich v. Lichtenstein, 'Frauendienst,' 30, 23, Sprenger suggests:

> Sô mich besezen
> nahtes habent die sorge alsam *diu mar* (= Nachtalp, Eng. *nightmare*).

The MS has *dú schar*; Lachmann and Bechstein read *die schar* (cf. M. H. D. Wb. II² 152).

96, 3 (311, 3):

> dô muosten *dan ze den juden* varn.—(L. and B.)
> si al di da gerangen wârn.

Sprenger reads *dâ ze den juden*.

109, 12 (348, 8):

> ich sprach '*nu vart den gotes haz.*—(L. and B.)
> Alsam ein boeswiht von mir hin.

S. proposes *nu vart en gotes haz.*

131, 29 (418, 1):

> Diu liet ich ûf dem wege sanc
> von mîner vrowen âne danc.
> daz kom dâ von *der bote mîn*
> *was ze vert*: des moht niht sîn,
> daz ichs iht sande ir bî im.

S. reads 'der bote mîn was mir *ze verre*' (war zu fern von mir); cf. Bechstein, p. 329.

482, 22 (1522, 4):

> ûf sînem helme der biderbe truoc
> ein kranz von *gansvedern wîz:*
> sîn helme geworht was wol mit fîlz:
> sîn schilt was gar von golde rôt,
> als im sîn hôher muot gebôt.—(L. and B.)

The MS has (482, 23) *gansvedern groz und weis.* In line 24, *was* was supplied by L. and B. Sprenger reads:

> ûf sînem helme der biderbe truoc
> ein kranz von *vedern glanz und wîz:*
> sîn helme geworht wol mit fîlz.

601, 8 and 9 (Ulrich's Frauenbuch), reads:

> sagt an, wie lebt ir iuriu jâr?
> ir füllet iuch *mit willen* an.

Sieh an vüllen in Lexer. III 563 = 'sich bedecken, bekleiden,' and in illustration the above single example; *mit willen* remains unexplained. In 603, 1 the lady seeks to refute the arguments of the knight:

> ir jeht wir frowen uns fluen an
> dâ mit daz wir niht schône hân
> mit kleiden nu als ê den lîp.

Instead of *fullen* in 601, 9, we have here *fluen.* Sprenger suggests for both the weak verb *wîlen* (verschleiern), and reads, 601, 9:

> ir wîlet iuch mit wîlen an.

603, 1:

> ir jeht, wir frouwen uns wîlen an,
> *dâ mit . . .*

dâ mit = 'dazu,' Eng. *besides.* He translates: 'Ihr sagt, dass wir Frauen uns verschleiern: dazu (behauptet ihr noch), dass wir nicht wie früher den Leib mit Kleidern schön zieren.'

Sprenger now agrees with Ehrismann's reading of L. 316, 17 in Rüdeger von Hunkhofen's 'Schlegel':

> dise zwêne süne sint gar
> *gedûht* in ein kaeskar

but, in spite of Schmeller[2], I 495, maintains that *gedûht* should read *gedruckt* (gedrückt). According to Haupt (Erzählung vom übelen Weibe, 1877), *Hunk-*hofen, and not *Hund*hofen, is the author's name.

The inf. noun *Winkelsehen* is connected in the M. H. D. Wb. II 2, p. 281, with *Winkel* (corner). Sprenger proposes *Winkelsehen* = 'zwinkern mit den Augen,' which evidently suits the sense of a number of lines much better (cf. Neidhart, 36, 29; Heinrich v. Türlin's Krone, 25050; Urstende, 127, 5, etc.). Weigand's German Dict. connects the Middle L. Dutch *proiêl* (Tiergarten) with *brühl* (Middle Latin *brôilus, brolius*). No doubt the word is derived from the French *praiel* (*préau*), which in turn goes back to the Middle Latin *pratellum, praticulum.* This word also appears in the Middle Low German as *priêl, proyêl,* in the sense of 'Lustgarten' (cf. Mittelniederd. Wb. 3, 376).

A. Mitzschke prints a fragment (14th century) from "Bruder Philipps Marienleben," and part of a Latin-German glossary of 1410, copied from a MS in Count Schönborn's library at Sommersfelden. The same author sends an article on "Vermischung von Präposition + Artikel mit folgender Ortsbezeichnung." Imperial Byzantium was to the Greek inhabitants in and about the capital the simple Πόλις. Hearing the εἰς τὰν πόλιν (*es tam bolin* in later Greek pronunciation) so frequently from the mouth of his new subjects, the Turkish conqueror took it to be the name of the capital, and formed his own *Istambol* (or Stambul), for Constantinople.[1] Thus the Turkish *Ismir* for Smyrna, from εἰς Σμύρνην; *Isnik* for Nicaea, from εἰς Νίκαιαν, etc. A similar blending together of article and names of places occurs likewise in German, and in a number of cases the official name of a place differs from that which lives in the mouth of the people; for instance, the little borough of Kranichfeld, upon the river Ilm (Thuringia), is called by the peasantry 'Insflackn,' i. e. 'in das Flecken.' Instead of 'Aue,' near Kamburg, upon the Saale, they say 'Drau' = 'in der Au.' Eicha, near Römhild, becomes 'Dräg' = 'zu der Eich,' etc. Particularly frequent is the fusion of *zum, am, im* and names of places. Thus Menzenberg, near Köln, from 'am Enzenberg'; Möckers, near Wasungen, from 'zum Öckers'; Meschenbach, from 'zum Eschenbach,' etc.

F. W. E. Roth continues his "Mittheilungen aus mittelhochdeutschen Handschriften und alten Drucken" from vol. 36 of the Germania, and K. Borinsky sends a "Nachtrag, den Verfasser der Robertbearbeitung betreffend." B.'s communication throws some light on the literary activity of the clergy in the last decades of the 15th century.

A. L. Stiefel has "Nachträge und Berichtigungen 'regarding the Sources of Hans Sachs' Shrove Tuesday Plays'" (cf. Am. J. of Phil., Reports, vol. XIV). Stiefel claims to have been the first to trace back to their proper source the fables and plays 'Die frumb schwiger kupelt ir dochter' (No. 74) and 'Die zwen gefattern mit dem zorn' (No. 82). From his account it appears that the original fables upon which H. Sachs based his narrative poems, and subsequently the two plays, are found in Hugo von Trimberg's 'Renner' (1260–1309). The date at which the Renner MS first appeared in print, as well as the language, argue that Sachs used the printed and more modern text of H. v. Trimberg's work.

Some Latin verses of the 12th century, a minor communication "Zu den Konungasogur," and criticisms of Lienhart Hans' 'Laut- und Flexionslehre der Mundart des mittleren Zornthals im Elsasz' (Alsatische Studien, H. 1), and Richard Haage's "Dietrich Scherenberg und sein Spiel von Frau Jutten," Marbg. Dissert. 1891 (the last favorable), close the second number of vol. 37.

Fr. Kaufmann, "Ueber althochdeutsche Orthographie" The question whether the O. H. G. orthography is a safe guide in determining the pronunciation, and whether we are always justified in settling this point by a reference to our modern dialects, has been frequently discussed. Braune (Ahd. Gram. §88, 2) is of opinion that the phonetic value that belongs to the O. H. G. characters cannot, upon the whole, be determined with perfect certainty, but that for the Franconian MSS, and probably for some others, the modern dialects may aid us somewhat in ascertaining the O. H. G. sound of those

[1] See A. J. P. VIII 81.

characters. Kaufmann adds that the inquiries into this subject have had the tendency of shaking the confidence in the value of O. H. G. *spelling* to show the *pronunciation*, and, furthermore, that their history is by no means identical, having developed, in many cases, wholly independent of each other. Prior to the Carlovingian time, two systems of writing especially deserve our attention, the Merovingian and the Anglo-Saxon, which both found their way into the interior of Germany. While the orthography of the former predominates in the official deeds of the western part of the Empire, we find that the larger number of those drawn up in Germany only partly conform to the Merovingian system, exhibiting certain characteristics foreign to it, as, for instance, the use of the letter *k*. At an older period the Latin *c* had to supply the place, not only of the later *k* and *g*, but also that of *h* and *z*. There was no apparent necessity to further enlarge the Latin alphabet by this stranger *k*. What was its origin? This important question, K. thinks, has not received the attention it deserves, and proceeds to discuss, in a highly suggestive paper, the O. H. G. gutturals in general and *k* in particular, referring the important position of the latter in the O. H. G. alphabet to the influence of the Anglo-Saxon and Irish scribes and their system of orthography. " Dem Einfluss Ags. Schriftwesens nachzu-forschen, ist für die allgemeine Culturbewegung des 8. Jh. sehr lehrreich. Sind doch Angel-Sachsen ihre hauptsächlichsten Träger gewesen, und ist uns im Einzelnen und Kleinen über ihre Thätigkeit so wenig bekannt. Die allmälig immer mehr an Umfang und Bedeutung zunehmende Verwendung des Buchstaben *k* liefert beachtenswerthe Anhaltspunkte."

Adalbert Jeitteles, "M. H. D. Tôre." In this article the writer furnishes a number of quotations from M. H. G. texts in which the words *tôre, ertôren* = 'Thor, zum Thoren werden' (cf. M. H. D. Wb.), are found with the meaning of *taub, taub werden*. In this sense they occur: Speculum ecclesiae, ed. Kelle, p. 10; Deut. Predigten, ed. Grieshaber, I 91; Lambrecht's von Regensburg, San Franzisken Leben, ed. Weinhold, L. 4748; Hadamar von Laber, Str. 158; Reinhard Fuchs, ed. Grimm, p. 339, L. 1320; p. 338, L. 1274. Comp. also Pfeiffer, Walther v. d. Vogelweide, 1st ed., p. 202, and Albert Höfer in Germania, XIV, p. 205. In a second paper Jeitteles shows that the text of the interesting song 'Blumenmacher Jesus,' taken from a MS formerly in possession of F. W. Roth, and claimed by the latter to be superior to the Mone version (cf. Am. J. of Phil., Reports, above), is really inferior. Comp. Bolte, Zeitsch. f. deut. Alt. 34, 26; 36, 95.

R. F. Kaindl sends "Bemerkungen über den Gebrauch der Fremdwörter bei Gottfried v. Strassburg," in which he maintains that the French sentences, salutations, etc., in the Tristan were taken by Gottfried from the French original, after slightly altering them to suit the German accentuation. This is contrary to the view of Golther (cf. ed. of Tristan) and others, who, although they grant that Gottfried's epic is, to some extent, a translation of the work of the trouvère Thomas, reject the idea that the French verses are those of the original, since they conform in but few instances to the rules of French prosody. Kaindl's article gives a great deal of information on the clever use which Gottfried made of foreign words, and in the course of his arguments treats of the curious word *Setmunt* in Tristan, V 12220:

> " Sô wirt mîn herze sâ zestunt
> groezer danne *setmunt*."

Maszmann, Kurz and Simrock took the second syllable to mean *mons, septemunt* (setmunt) = 'Siebenbürgen, die sieben Berge' (near Bonn). Jänicke thinks of the *Septimer*, across which, in the Middle Ages, the road led from S. W. Germany into Italy. Bechstein reads (munt = mundus) *sferemunt* (MS *h*), *sphaeremunt = Sphärenwelt*. Kaindl suggests the reading *cet munt*, i. e. *diese Welt*.

F. W. E. Roth supplements his "Mittheilungen aus M. H. D. Handschriften" of the last vol., and Gustav Ehrismann continues the list of works on the field of German philology for 1888. A favorable criticism of Behaghel and Gallée's Altsächsische Grammatik (1st part, Laut- u. Flexionslehre), and some minor communications of a personal nature, close the third number of vol. 37.

Ed. David's paper, " Die Wortbildung der Mundart von Krofdorf," is a valuable contribution to the researches now actively carried on by German philologists into the dialects of Germany. The village of Krofdorf lies about five miles from Giessen (Hessen) and boasts of 1500 inhabitants, who, notwithstanding their lively intercourse with the neighboring Giessen, and in spite of the influence of the church and school language, speak among themselves a sharply defined dialect that, in keeping with the geographical position of the village, belongs to the Rhine Frankish. In the analysis and description of the sounds in the dialect D. follows, in the main, the system of F. Kaufmann (Anleitung zur deutschen Landes- und Volksforschung, Abschnitt: Dialectforschung).

Gust. Binz publishes some Bâle fragments of Jan Boendale's 'Lekenspiegel.' They seem to belong to a version not known heretofore.

R. Sprenger, in some brief communications, suggests emendations in various M. H. G. verses; we quote 'Zu Albers Tnugdalus.' The verses 913–17, in Wagner's edition (Hahn, 51, 64), read:

> dâ wâren die verschaffen
> leien unde pfaffen
> dâ wâren die *bescherten* ;
> die selben schar mêrten
> rîter unde gebûren.

Sprenger thinks it more plausible to conjecture the reading *dâ wâren die bichêrten* = 'da waren die (vom Teufel) Verführten,' instead of *bescherten* = 'Verachteten, Verschmähten.' The last was an emendation of Heinzel. The MS has *bicherten*. 'Zur Vogelbeize,' verses 40–4 (Schaufler, Quellenbüchlein, etc., Leipzig, 1892), read:

> dô ez der antvogel wart gewar,
> vil stille ez si ûfstoubte,
> einen antvogel ez dar under *doubte*
> alsô daz er gelac für tôt.

Sprenger suggests *cloubte* = ' zerzauste,' instead of *doubte* = ' betäubte.'

Ed. Damköhler gives a different interpretation from the usual one, of a number of words and verses in 'Reinke de Vos,' and H. Reis has a short article on "Mischung von Schriftsprache und Mundart in Rheinhessen." The curious blending of 'Schriftsprache' and dialect which the writer investigates and describes developed in and about Mayence.

K. Hartmann prints a large number of "Volksräthsel," and G. Ehrismann sends an article on the Germanic prefixes *miss* and *voll*, in which he treats of their form, accent and occurrence in the older Teutonic.

A minor communication, "Zur strophischen Bearbeitung des Herzog Ernst," by Sprenger, a bibliographical summary by Ehrismann, and a list of contributors and their articles in vols. 25–37 of the Germania closes the 37th vol.

The publishing firm, Carl Gerold's Sohn, of Vienna, announces that the Germania will hereafter cease to be issued from their press. The insufficient number of subscriptions to cover the very heavy expenses of publication compelled this step.

<div style="text-align: right">C. F. RADDATZ.</div>

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, Vol. XLVI.[1]

Pp. 1–8. U. Köhler examines the votive inscription Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέθεσαν τὴν στοὰν καὶ τὰ ὁπλ[α κ]αὶ τἀκρωτήρια ἑλόντες τῶν πο[λεμίω]ν, which was found at Delphi in 1880 by Haussoullier, in the débris of the hall of the Athenians. This inscription proves the date of its construction to have been B. C. 488, the same year in which the battle of Aegina was fought (Herodot. V 79–90, VI 87–94), and not B. C. 429, as mentioned by Pausanias, X 11, 6.

Pp. 9–24. M. Kiderlin sends a batch of critical notes to and emendations of the Xth book of Quintilian.

Pp. 25–46. A. Dieterich. The sleep-scenes on the Attic stage. The author attempts to prove by a comparison of Heracles, 1016 ff., and Trachiniae, 947 ff., that the play of Sophocles was composed later than that of Euripides, who, in fact, gave the impetus to the former. In the Heracles these scenes are a natural consequence of the myth, an organic part of the whole, which is not the case with the Trachiniae. Again, the sleep-scene in the Orestes (B. C. 408), ll. 822 ff., is an imitation of that in the Philoctetes (B. C. 409), ll. 822 ff. This explains, for the first time, the many agreements between the Heracles and the Trachiniae, the former of which was enacted between B. C. 422 and 421, the latter at about B. C. 419.

Pp. 47–53. K. Dziatzko believes that the remnants of the earliest collation of the Codex Bembinus of Terence, preserved by Angelo Poliziano and Bernardo Bembo (1457 A. D.), must be examined with the greatest caution and reserve. The Terence Codex at Wolfenbüttel (Gud. 31) shows signs of an independent, though limited, use of the Bembinus.

Pp. 54–70. J. G. Sprengel. The chief sources for the elder Pliny in the composition of bks. XII and XIII of his Hist. Nat. were extracts from the two geographical works of Juba in their original order. All the other authors,

with the exception of Hyginus and the Book of Unguents, are consulted only for occasional remarks. Thus we would have the following authorities—for botany, Juba, Hyginus, Trogus, Corn. Nepos, Vergil, Mucianus; for medicine, Sextus Niger; for unguents, Apollodorus and Fabianus; for history and anecdotes, Varro, Claudius Caesar; geography, Sebosus; poets, Homer and Vergil.

Pp. 71–6. E. Graf. Διαύλιον is the same as αὔλημα. There is in the Greek drama not a single case on record in which the assumption of the accompaniment of the singer by a musician stationed behind the scenes is necessary. The ἔνδον of the schol. to Ar. Ran. 1264 has been erroneously explained as a διαύλιον by the schol. to Ar. Av. 222.

Pp. 77–98. Joh. Schmidt. A contribution to the chronology of the writings of Tertullian and of the Proconsuls of Africa. The 'de corona' was written either in Aug. or Sept. of A. D. 211; the 'libellus ad Scapulam' after the total eclipse of the sun on Aug. 14, A. D. 212. Accordingly we have to date the 'de fuga in persecutione' and the 'Scorpiace.' T. Flavius Decimus was proconsul of Africa in 209; Valerius Prudens in 210(or 209)–211; Scapula from 211 until about 213. The administration of Vespronius Candidus falls between the years 183/5–193.

Pp. 99–105. According to G. Oehmichen the interpretation of Vitruvius 120, 10 ff., by Petersen (Wiener Studien, VII 175 ff.), regarding the auxiliary circles in the plan of the ancient theatre, are incorrect. On pp. 337–42 E. Fabricius contradicts some of Oehmichen's statements and defends Vitruvius against several strictures on the part of Oehmichen.

Pp. 106–11. In 1864 Pallmann published, in the second part of his Geschichte der Völkerwanderung (pp. 504 ff.), a short chronological history from Adam to 452 A. D. C. Frick now determines the relations which exist between the four MSS thus far known, and shows that they all go back to one and the same archetype, an Orosius MS.

Pp. 112–38. A. Elter believes that the 'Vaticani montis imago' of Horace, Carm. I 20, can only have been the so-called echo of the Gianicolo. The difficulty which still exists is removed by the passage of Cicero ad Attic. XIII 33, 4, where the 'montes Vaticani' designate the hills surrounding the Prati di Castello and the Vatican plain, from the Monte Mario downward. At the time of Horace and Juvenal the mons Vaticanus did not yet exist as a proper name. Vaticanum originally was the name of an (Etruscan) settlement, in later years the designation for the whole plain between the Tiber and the mountains (ager Vaticanus); since the time of the Neronian circus the name is fixed on this. Still later the name was confined to the sepulchre of St. Peter and the church on that spot, whence the whole region became the mons Vaticanus κατ' ἐξοχήν.

Pp. 139–60. A. Ludwich reads Aesch. Eum. 103/105 ὁρᾷ δὲ πληγὰς τάσδε καρδία σέθεν. | ἀνήμερος δὲ μοῖρα προσκόποις βροτῶν.—A. Frederking suggests Antig. 847 οἷα (alone, forsaken) φίλων.—Fr. Rühl. Zosimus wrote under Anastasius, after A. D. 501, and is probably identical with the Sophist of Ascalon or Gaza, mentioned by Suidas.—Fr. Schlee prints additional

material to the description of the Laurentianus, XXXVIII 24 (Victorianus D),
of Terence, given by Umpfenbach in his preface, pp. xviii–xxii.—M. Manitius
shows that Commodian, in his 'instructiones,' has used the 'Disticha Catonis,'
which, therefore, cannot be dated later than the first half of saec. III.—Th.
Birt. The symbolic use of 'cucurbita' is not alone found in Seneca Apocolo-
cyntosis and Apotheosis, but also in other authors, to express weak-minded-
ness, e. g. Juvenal 14, 56; Apul. met. I 15, and especially Hermippus, frg. 79
(K.) τὴν κεφαλὴν ὅσην ἔχει ὅσην κολοκύντην (i. e. Pericles). He also discusses
the 'vox implicita' of emperor Claudius.—A. Schoene reads Tacitus H. II
100 ut *atsimiles sint*; Agric. 11 also *atsimiles sunt*; ib. 6 *inerti erat* silentium ;
25 *in itinere* for *itinera*.—O. Seeck. New dates of eclipses for the Roman
chronology.—F. B. The pretty Latin riddle on Terminus, copied from Varro
by Aul. Gell. 12. 6, is to be restored thus: Semel minusne an bis minus sit
non sat scio | an utrumque eorum: ut quondam audivi dicier | ipsi Iovi regi
noluit concedere.—Papadopulos-Kerameus corrects a mistake in the interpre-
tation by Cichorius (Rhein. Mus. 44, 440; A. J. P. XI 385) of the treaty
between Rome and Methymna.

Pp. 161–92. A. Papadopulos-Kerameus publishes the text of a portion of
Apollodorus' Bibliotheca found in a MS of the Laura of St. Abbas (Codex
Sabbaiticus, No. 336, fol. 114*a*–125*b*). This MS belonged to the collection of
the patriarch Nicodemus I of Jerusalem. Thus far there were known only
parts of this precious MS. On pp. 617–18 H. Diels prints a few emendations
of the text as published by Papadopulos, based on a new collation by H.
Achelis of the readings of this Jerusalem fragment of Apollodorus.

Pp. 193–232. K. Buresch. Γέγοναν and similar formations in late Greek.
A main source of our knowledge of the Alexandro-Egyptian dialect are the
uncial MSS of the New Testament, a fact not sufficiently recognized by
Lachmann and Tischendorf. To this dialect belong especially the peculiar
forms that are common to Codd. Sin. and Alex., above all the 3d plur. of
perfects, e. g. γέγοναν (Romans 16, 7), ἔοργαν, ἔσχηκαν, etc., which were
assimilated to the aorist. Such forms cannot be ascribed to Herodes Atticus ;
and this proves that the inscription examined in Rhein. Mus. 44, 506 ff. (A. J.
P. XI 387), is an old forgery. The article is of special interest and importance
to the student of the New Testament.

Pp. 233–43. F. Bücheler continues his excellent contributions to the knowl-
edge of Old Latin (see vol. XLV 159; A. J. P. XII 373). (16) The correct
form in Plautus is *acieris*, not *acceris*, which stands in the same relation to *acies*
as *speres* to *spes*.—(17) The spelling *terruncius* with *rr* is correct in Plautus,
etc.; it shows that *terr* (from *ters = τρίς*) is the older form of the numeral
adverb, and also explains Plaut. Bacch. 1127.—(18) The original numerical
sign for *centum* was 0 for θ (just as φ for 1000 and χ for 50). Later the form
C was developed under the influence of the initial letter of *centum*, just as S
for *semis*, T for *terruncius*.—(19) According to Priscian, I 34, p. 26, H., the
usage of the 'antiqui' are the forms *compes, competis = compos, -potis,* not
compos-, pedis = pes, -pedis, as Schweizer-Sidler and Surber teach. *Compes* as a
nominative was coined in the Augustan era from the substantivized plur. adjec.
compedeis, compedium.

Pp. 244–9. P. Cauer examines the origin and growth of the Omphale myth.

Pp. 250–86. J. M. Stahl discusses the six Athenian decrees of amnesty recorded in ancient authors, viz. that of Solon (Plut. Solon 19), the one dating from the time of the Persian wars (mentioned by Andocides, de mysteriis, §107 f.), that of Patroclides during the siege of Athens by Lysander (Andoc. Myst. §73; Xen. Hell. II 2, 11; Lys. 25, 27), the one stipulated by Lysander (Andoc. l. c. 80; Xen. Hell. II 2, 20), that decreed after the expulsion of the thirty (403 B. C., Xen. Hell. II 4, 38), and the one proposed by Hypereides after the battle of Chaeronea (Ps.-Dem. 26, 11; Lyc. 41).   They all differ from one another as regards cause and aim, size and method of proposal. Additional notes on the basis of statements in the ’Αθ. πολ. of Arist. are printed on pp. 481–7.

Pp. 287–98. C. Hosius sends a communication on several Italian MSS of Juvenal, Ovid, Lucan, Claudian and Martial, with variant readings to the extant editions of these authors.

Pp. 299–310. Th. Kock answers the twenty objections which v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (Hermes, XV 491; Euripides, Heracles, I 42, rem. 82) raised against the genuineness of Euripides, fragm. 953 (Nauck, 2d ed.); cf. also Kock in Rhein. Mus. 35, 264 ff.

Pp. 311–17. O. Rossbach emends Petron. sat. 25 and 62; Sil. Ital. Pun. VIII 385; Front. strateg. I 4, 4; 5, 3; 7, 2; II 5, 4; 5, 45, etc.; Apul. met. II 2, VII 18, I 5; Symmachus, orat. I 16, II 24; Hist. Apoll. 8, 16, 18, 28, 42, 46.

Pp. 318–36. O. Crusius explains Babrius fab. 2, 1; 86, 8; 95, 35 and corrects 142, 2 τὸν δ’ εἶδ’ ἀλώπηξ καγχάσασα δ’ εἰρήκει.—C. Fr. Müller sends an alphabetic acrostic of Ignatius Diaconus, and prints again another attributed to the same author and published first by Boissonade in Anecdota Graeca, IV 436 f.—M. Ihm reads Jos. Bell. Jud. IV 10, 5 μέχρι Κλείθρου (= the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb) for μέχρι Κοπτοῦ.—B. Kuebler corrects Dio Cass. frag. 52, 1 (ed. Melber); 56, 9; 85, 4 and Lib. 36, 51. 2 τῷ παιδὶ αὑτοῦ (for αὐτοῦ); 37, 1. 2 ὅπως ἐν τῷ <χρόνῳ> (= intra tempus) θαρσοῦσι, . . . οἱ ἐπίθηται.—F. Susemihl emends Diog. Laert. VII 54, reading διαφερόμενος πρὸς αὐτὸν (not αὐτόν).— C. Wachsmuth, Arist. ’Αθ. πολ. 42, 9 ff. (ed. Ken.), confirms the statement of Pausanias as regards the location of the Theseion and the Acte (’Ακτή), the name given to the southern peninsula of the Peiraeus.   The same writer calls attention to the fact that ancient historical works of great length were usually divided into series of five books.—O. Ribbeck reads Propert. V 2, 39 *curvarier* (for *curare vel*); 13 ff. *huic* three times for the traditional *hic*; 19 *iaces falsus* (not *uaces, alius*); 4, 47 *potabitur* (for *pugnabitur*); 83 ff. *ascensus dubiis— remissus—praemia erant somno*; 94 *praemia fontis*; 9, 24 *laurus* for *lucus*; 34 *hospita valla* (not *vana*); 60 *unda fluit* (not *una fuit*).—O. R. also believes that the Orationes Sallustii (Seneca, Controv. 3, praef. 8) were independent speeches delivered by Sallust, not the speeches found in his historical work. Joh. Schmidt fixes the location of the municipium Numiulitanum and municipium Thimidabure (called hitherto Thimbure) in the Provincia Africana.

W. Muss-Arnolt.

BRIEF MENTION.

The publication of VON GEBHARDT's phototypic reproduction of the *Gospel of Peter and the Revelation of Peter* (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs) has followed hard on the appearance of the facsimile in the *Mémoires de la mission archéologique française au Caire*. The French facsimile is expensive ; the German is to be had at a reasonable price (12 m. 50 pf.), and will be welcome to all students of these remarkable documents. In his introduction von Gebhardt sets forth the advantages of his phototype over the retouched photogravure, describes the MS at length, comments on the plates, and registers the literature. Then follow text with variants and the plates. Still, after all that has been done, the hard passages remain hard passages, and the very first of them does not seem to have found a satisfactory solution yet. In Ev. Petri v. 3 we read : Οἱ δὲ λαβόντες τὸν κύριον ὤθουν αὐτὸν τρέχοντες καὶ ἔλεγον Σύρωμεν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξουσίαν αὐτοῦ ἐσχηκότες. σύρωμεν is the MS reading, according to von Gebhardt. Beuriant had read εὔρωμεν, and there is a cloud of conjectures— ἄρωμεν, αἴρωμεν, κυρῶμεν, θυμῶμεν and σταυρῶμεν, of which the last seems the most likely. All, however, except the utterly unacceptable κυρῶμεν, overlook the mocking character of the shouts of the multitude, and from that point of view εὕρομεν would not be so bad. The people would cry εὕρομεν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ in jest as Andrew said εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν in earnest. ἔφυγον κακόν, εὗρον ἄμεινον. But this would require a further change. We should then have to read <καὶ> ἐξουσίαν αὐτοῦ ἐσχηκότες πορφύραν αὐτὸν περιέβαλον, and though a participial clause does not seem natural as part of a yell, I am too cautious to suggest such a reading. One cannot help wishing, however, that there were a good excuse for reading στεφανῶμεν, which would perfectly satisfy the craving for a good sense.

———

Mr. TUCKER's work is always interesting, his recent edition of the Supplices of Aischylos is well worth study, and his *Eighth Book of Thucydides* (Macmillan & Co.) is out of the ordinary run of school editions. In the introduction he has a word to say in favor of the particular book he has undertaken to edit, and agrees with those who attribute the absence of speeches in this part of the work to the absence of speeches in this stage of the war. 'There would seem, indeed,' he says, 'to have been no really great speeches delivered by great men in such circumstances that Thucydides could learn their substance sufficiently to report them in his characteristic manner.' 'Vigor and terseness,' he adds, 'are as marked as ever in the eighth book,' and 'ethically the Thucydidean authorship is beyond reasonable doubt.' Mr. Tucker finds himself unable to share the general impression 'that in point of composition it lacks finish, that it never received the *secundae curae* of the author, and that

therefore, apart from all textual corruption, its *anacolutha* and perplexities are more numerous than those of the earlier books.' With such bold words does Mr. Tucker challenge the horsemen to meet him on the plain, and it is to be hoped that the challenge will be accepted. 'If,' he concludes, 'the tortuousness of a given Thucydidean period is to be set down to want of revision, it immediately becomes necessary to consider every book, and not merely the eighth, as a book left "unrevised." It is tolerably certain that Thucydides would have found it much harder to revise his own Greek into perfect lucidity than either a Plato, a Demosthenes, or a modern editor would do. *Le style c'est de l'homme*, and revision, with some writers, is quite as likely to lead them farther from as it is to lead them nearer to syntactical simplicity.' It is evident that Mr. Tucker is one of those who go at least part of the way with Dionysios, and who recognize a certain purposefulness where others see only helplessness, who recognize a deliberate twist where others see only an impotent wriggle. So sound is this view, at least so closely coincident is it with my own, that I can forgive differences on minor points, such as are generally made too prominent in *Brief Mention.*

In his *Syntaxis infinitivi Plotiniani* (Upsala, 1893) Mr. NORDENSTAM shows a fair acquaintance with the literature of the Greek infinitive, and one or two of the phenomena that he registers are interesting, such as Plotinus's use of the adjective with the articular inf., e. g. τὸ ἀληθινὸν εἶναι instead of ἡ ἀληθινὴ οὐσία, and his freer employment of the genitive with the same. But it is hard to preserve one's gravity when one reads *memoratu dignissimum est quod Plotinus* πρὶν ἤ *semel posuit*. He evidently believes that Plotinus resurrected πρὶν ἤ from Homer and Hesiod, because Sturm has told him that the construction had vanished from Attic, but nothing is more common in post-classic Greek than πρὶν ἤ (A. J. P. IV 92), and the scribes being thoroughly familiar with it, have done their best to get it into our classic texts. *Quod semel posuit* ought to mean that 'he used it only once.' The section on the articular infinitive follows the lines of Hewlett's useful articles (A. J. P. XI), but if Mr. Nordenstam had read the Journal as closely as he has conned Mr. Hewlett's articles, he would not have denied the classical use of causal παρά with art. inf. Cf. A. J. P. XII 124 and Dem. 19, 42; 21, 96.

ALFRED GOODWIN, who died in February, 1892, had made elaborate preparations for a great edition of the *Homeric Hymns*, had collated MSS and caused them to be collated, and had made a beginning of a critical commentary, but the failure of his eyes during the last year of his life prevented him from continuing his work, and his posthumous papers seem to have yielded scanty gleanings. The business course would have been to abandon the publication, and to turn over Goodwin's papers, as so much material, to some Homeric scholar, but yielding to a natural feeling, the Delegates of the Clarendon Press intrusted Goodwin's former pupil and intimate friend, THOMAS WILLIAM

ALLEN, with the task of saving what was to be saved of Goodwin's work, and of bringing out an edition of the Homeric Hymns on Goodwin's lines. The result is a superb folio with four photographic plates, a full account of the MSS, full variants and an eclectic text. It is a memorial volume that appeals to the sympathies of all scholarly men; and though the conditions of the editorship were hampering in the extreme, still, as Mr. Allen is fully in accord with his departed friend as to the age and value of the Moscow MS, his scientific and his personal interest are so much at one that he could well undertake the delicate office of bringing out what he himself fears may seem to the outside world *exiguus fructus ingenii acris et pulchri.*

––––––

The most interesting part of Mr. VERRALL's *Choëphori* is the Introduction, in which he considers at great length the recognition scene of the play, and defends the poet against the well-known criticisms of Euripides in the Electra. According to Mr. Verrall, Euripides had not studied the Aeschylean text closely, and the signs to which the Aeschylean Electra yields credence are none of them so flimsy as Euripides represents them to be. The hair and the footprint are familiar marks of race, and the gird at the size of the foot is purely gratuitous. It was not the size but the shape of the foot that Aischylos was thinking of, and the shape of the foot, as well as the curl of the hair, may have been characteristic of the Pelopidæ, whom Mr. Verrall calls, by way of illustration, 'octoroons.' The illustration is not inapt, and an American student of the drama can readily imagine a colored Electra recognizing the kinky hair and 'gizzard foot' of a man and a brother. The third sign, the ὕφασμα, instead of being what Euripides wickedly insinuates it was, 'a piece of the wrapping in which Orestes was shawled,' is supposed by Mr. Verrall to have been a manner of girlish sampler. And so the critic Euripides is disposed of. Like so many brethren of the guild, Euripides was simply finding fault with what he happened to remember, or fancied he remembered, of the piece—a very natural proceeding—and Mr. Verrall has brought him to book with his usual acumen—an acumen which, unfortunately, is almost always excessive. In fact, the German proverb 'allzuscharf macht schartig' might seem to have been coined for Mr. Verrall's especial benefit, and his considerable gift of literary expression and undeniable literary sympathy do not compensate for all his wonderful verbal equivocations, resurrected vocables, archaic constructions and metrical licenses. There is no end of cleverness in Mr. Verrall's work, but it is a cleverness that enlightens only by flashes. There is no patient assemblage of Aeschylean facts, and in a commentary of such bulk more illustrations might be demanded. Not to dwell on grammatical points, in which Mr. Verrall is often simply hopeless, one would have expected, among other things, a more satisfactory note on μασχαλισμός (v. 439), or, at all events, some reference to Mr. Kittredge's careful article on 'Armpitting' in vol. VI of this Journal.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Harper (W. R.) and Castle (C. F.) Exercises in Greek Prose Composition, based on Xenophon's Anabasis, books 1–4. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1893. 127 pp. 12mo, hf. cl., 75 cts.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. V. 4. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893. 3 + 218 pp. il. 8vo, bds., $1.50.

Jastrow (M.) A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Ierushalmi and Midrashic Literature. In 12 pts. Pt. 6. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1893. 4to, pap., subs. $2.

Murray (Ja. A. H.) A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Pts. 6 and 7. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 8vo, cl., @ $3.75.

ENGLISH.

Aeschylus. Choephori. With an introduction, commentary and translation by A. W. Verrall. 8vo, 306 pp. *Macmillan.* 12s.

Ancient Manuscript of the Yasna, with its Pahlavi translation. Reproduced in facsimile and ed. by L. H. Mills. Fol. *Clarendon Press.* net, 210s.

Arrian's Anabasis of Alexander and Indica. Trans., with a copious commentary, by Edward James Chinnock. Maps. (Bohn's Classical Library.) Cr. 8vo, xx + 452 pp. *G. Bell & Sons.* 5s.

Chase (F. H.) The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae. 8vo, 172 pp. *Macmillan.* net, 7s. 6d.

Eutropius. Books 1 and 2. Ed. by W. Caldecott. 18mo. *Longmans.* 1s. 6d.

Evans (D. S.) Dictionary of the Welsh Language. Vol. 1. A–C. Roy. 8vo, 1250 pp. Carmarthen, *Spurrell. Simpkin.* 34s. 6d.

Gardner (P.) Catalogue of the Greek Vases in the Ashmolean Museum. Fol. *Clarendon Press.* net, 63s.

Goodwin (A.) Hymni Homerici. Fol. *Clarendon Press.* net, 21s.

Green (A. O.) A Practical Arabic Grammar. Part 2. 3d ed. Cr. 8vo. *Clarendon Press.* 10s. 6d.

Herodotus. VIII. Urania. With introduction and notes by E. S. Shuckburgh. Map. Cr. 8vo, xxxviii + 276 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse.* 4s.

Homer's Iliad. Book 6. Ed., with notes, introduction and vocabulary, by Walter Leaf and M. A. Bayfield. 18mo, 108 pp. *Macmillan.* 1s. 6d.

Horace. Odes and Carmen Seculare. Trans. into English verse by T. A. Walker. Cr. 8vo. *E. Stock.* 3s. 6d.

Horace. Odes and Epodes. Trans. by Sir S. De Vere. With preface and notes. Sq. 8vo. *Bell & Sons.* 7s. 6d.

Origen. Philocalia. Text revised, with a critical introduction and indices, by J. A. Robinson. Cr. 8vo, sd. *Cambridge University Press.* net, sd., 7s.; 7s. 6d.

Sepher Yetzirah. The Book of Formation. Trans. from the Hebrew by W. W. Westcott. 2d ed. Cr. 8vo. *Theosophical Pub. Co.* net, 2s. 6d.

Southesk (Earl of). Origins of Pictish Symbolism. Illust. Sm. 4to, 117 pp. Edinburgh, *D. Douglas.* 9s.

Tweedie (J.) Hindustani as it Ought to be Spoken. 2d ed. Cr. 8vo. *Thacker.* 6s.

Xenophon's Anabasis. Books 1 and 2. With English notes by A. Pretor. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo. *Cambridge University Press.* 4s.

—— Book 6. Ed. for the use of schools by Rev. G. H. Nall. 18mo, 178 pp. *Macmillan.* 1s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Chansons populaires arabes en dialecte du Caire, par M. U. Bouriant. In-8 (texte arabe). *Leroux.* 10 fr.

Koschwitz (Edouard). Les parlers parisiens. Anthologie phonétique. In-8. *Welter.* Cart., 4 fr. 50.

Sicard (Gaston). Guide de la prononciation française. *P. Delarue.* 2 fr.

GERMAN.

Abicht (K.) Uebersicht üb. den Dialekt des Herodotos. 4. Aufl. gr. 8. 42 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* kart., m. —50.

Alexi (Theochar). Deutsch-rumänisches Wörterbuch f. Schule u. Umgang. 9. Taus. 8. xii, 312 S. Kronstadt, *H. Zeidner.* m. 2.80.

Analecta Graeciensia. Festschrift zur 42. Versammlg. deutscher Philologen u. Schulmänner in Wien, 1893. Von Professoren der k. k. Karl-Franzens-Universität, Gratz. gr. 8. iii, 217 S. Gratz, Styria. m. 10.

Arati phaenomena, recensuit Ernst Maass. gr. 8. xxxvi, 100 S. B., *Weidmann.* m. 5.

Bachmann's (J.) Tabellen zur hebräischen Grammatik. Nr. XI–XIII, XIV *a* u. *b*, XV, XVIII u. XIX *b*. qu. Fol. u. qu. gr. Fol. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.* @ m. —20.

Beiträge, Münchener, zur romanischen u. englischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. H. Breymann u. E. Koeppel. V. gr. 8. L., *A. Deichert Nachf.*—V. Die Sprache Philippes de Beaumanoir in seinen poetischen Werken. Eine Lautuntersuchg. Von A. C. Albert. vi, 60 S. m. 1.50.

Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Hrsg. v. M. Schanz. III. Bd. 4. Hft. (der ganzen Reihe 10. Hft.). gr. 8. Würzburg, *A. Stuber's Verl.*—4. Geschichte des Pronomen reflexivum. Von Dr. Adf. Dyroff. 2. Abtlg. Die att. Prosa u. Schlussergebnisse. 186 S. m. 4.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. X. Bd. 1. Lfg. gr. 4. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 10.—X 1. Die alt-

persischen Keilinschriften, hrsg. v. F. W. Weissbach u. W. Bang. 1. Lfg.
48 S. m. 4 Doppeltaf. m. 10.

Birt (Thdr.) De Xenophontis commentariorum Socraticorum compo-
sitione. gr. 4. xxii S. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 1.

Boer (R. C.) Bjarnar Saga Hítdoelakappa. Hrsg. v. R. C. B. gr. 8.
xliv, 112 S. Halle a. S., *M. Niemeyer.* m. 4.

Boesch (Frdr.) De XII tabularum lege a Graecis petita. Quaestiones
philologae. Diss. gr. 8. v, 89 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 2.50.

Brandt (W.) Mandäische Schriften aus der Sammlung Genzâ od. Sidrâ
Rabbâ, übers. u. erläutert. gr. 8. xix, 232 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck &*
Ruprecht. m. 8.

Brugmann (Karl). Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indo-
germanischen Sprachen. gr. 8. vii, 236 S. Strassburg i. E., *K. J. Trübner*
Verl. m. 6. (kplt. m. Register, m. 56.)

Bucksath (Max). Anleitung zum Erlernen der malaischen Sprache. 16.
71 S. Bremen, *H. Drewes.* kart., m. 1.20.

Bühler (G.) J. Kirste's Collation des Textes der Yâjñavalkya-Smṛiti,
hrsg. v. G. B. [Aus "Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Imp.-4. 11 S.
Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.* m. —90.

Büttner (Rich.) Porcius Licinus u. der litterarische Kreis des Q. Luta-
tius Catulus. gr. 8. iii, 206 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 5.

Caesaris (C. Iulii) commentaria de bello civili. Für den Schulgebr.
erklärt v. Prof. Rud. Menge. m. 2.40.

Carrière (A.) Nouvelles sources de Moïse de Khoren. Études critiques.
8. vii, 56 S. Wien, *Gerold & Co.* m. 4.

Cicero's Briefe. Auswahl. Für den Schulgebr. hrsg. v. Adf. Lange.
8. 172 S. m. 4 Fig. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh.* Geb. in Leinw., m. 1.40.

—— ausgewählte Briefe. Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. Jos. Frey.
5. Aufl. gr. 8. viii, 256 S. L., *B. 'G. Teubner.* m. 2.25.

—— epistularum libri XVI, edidit Ludw. Mendelssohn. gr. 8. xxxiii,
460 S. Ebd. m. 12.

Codex Festi Farnesianus XLII tabulis (phototypicis) expressus. (v S.
Text.) Budapestini. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.* In Mappe m. 42.

Cornelius Nepos, in Auswahl, bearb. u. verm. durch e. Vita Alexandri
Magni v. Frz. Fügner. Text. gr. 8. 104 S. m. 3 farb. Karten. L., *B. G.*
Teubner. m. 1; kart., m. 1.40.

Edlinger (Aug. v.) Ueb. die Bildung der Begriffe. II. Lfg. B. gr. 8.
München, *L. Finsterlin.*—II 1. Alte Farbenbezeichnungen. 2. Ueber die
Verwandtschaft der türk. Spr. m. der indogerm. 3. Bach–Butte. iv u. S.
73–131. m. 2.

Freund (S.) Die Zeitsätze im Arabischen. gr. 8. vii, 107 S. Breslau,
W. Jacobsohn & Co. m. 3.

Funk (B.) Kurze Anleitung zum Verständniss der Samoanischen
Sprache. 8. v, 82 S. B., *E. S. Mittler & Sohn.* m. 4.50; geb. in Leinw.,
m. 5.

Goetzeler (Ludw.) Animadversiones in Dionysii Halicarnassensis anti-
quitates romanas. Pars I. gr. 8. 84 S. München, *Th. Ackermann.* m. 2.

Goldziher (Ign.) Der Dîwân des Garval b. Aus Al-Ḥuṭej'a. Bearb. v. I. G. [Aus "Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch."] gr. 8. 245 S. L., *F. A. Brockhaus' Sort. in Komm.* m. 6.

Gregorius (Adph.) De M. Annaei Lucani Pharsaliae tropis. Pars I. (De metaphora, synecdoche, antonomasia.) Diss. gr. 8. 76 S. L., *G. Fock.* m. 1.50.

Gröber (Gust.) Grundriss der romanischen Philologie. Lex.-8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 4.80. (I–II, 2 I, m. 22.80.)—I 2. S. 257–432. m. 2.80.—II 1. 128 S. m. 2.

Heller (Mart.) Quibus auctoribus Aristoteles in Republica Atheniensium conscribenda et qua ratione usus sit. Diss. gr. 8. 57 S. B., *Mayer & Müller.* m. 1.50.

Herbst (Ludw.) Zu Thukydides. Erklärungen u. Wiederherstellgn. 2. Reihe. Buch V–VIII. gr. 8. viii, 159 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.60. (1 u. 2, m. 6.40.)

Herodas. Mimiamben. Hrsg. u. erklärt v. Rich. Meister. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8. 274 S. L., *S. Hirzel.* m. 10.

Hieroclis Synecdemus. Recensuit Aug. Burckhardt. 8. xlix, 88 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 1.20.

Holtzmann (Adf.) Die 19 Bücher des Mahābhārata. gr. 8. v, 298 S. Kiel, *C. F. Haeseler's Verl.* m. 12. (I u. II, m. 22.60.)

Homer's Odyssee. Erklärt v. Vict. Hugo Koch. Neu bearb. v. Capelle. 1. Hft. (a–δ). gr. 8. 179 S. Hannover, *Hahn.* m. 1.20.

Hommel (Fritz). Südarabische Chrestomathie. gr. 4. vi, 136 autogr. S. München, *H. Lukaschik.* kart., m. 16.50.

Horati Flacci (Q.) sermonum et epistularum libri. Mit Anmerkgn. v. Lucian Mueller. 2. Thl. Episteln. gr. 8. iv, 346 S. Prag, *F. Tempsky.* L., *G. Freytag.* à m. 8.

Horn (Ferd.) Platonstudien. gr. 8. xii, 408 S. Wien, *F. Tempsky.* m. 6.

Jeep (Ludw.) Zur Geschichte der Lehre v. den Redetheilen bei den lateinischen Grammatikern. gr. 8. xvii, 316 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 8.

Jiriczek (Otto Luitp.) Die Bósa-Saga in zwei Fassungen. 8. lxxx, 164 S. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 7.

Klaeber (Frdr.) Das Bild bei Chaucer. gr. 8. viii, 454 S. B., *R. Heinrich.* m. 12.

Konow (Sten). Das Sāmavidhāna brāhmaṇa. Eingel. u. übers. v. S. K. gr. 8. vii, 83 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 4.

Kunze (Alfr.) Sallustiana. 2. Hft. Der Gebrauch v. *fore, futurum esse, foret, forent, essem* u. seinen Formen. gr. 8. vii, 100 S. L., *Simmel & Co.* m. 2.

Lidzbarski (Marcell.) De propheticis, quae dicuntur, legendis arabicis. Diss. gr. 8. 64 S. Lipsiae. B., *Mayer & Müller.* m. 2.

Livi (Titi) ab urbe condita liber XXIX. Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. Frz. Luterbacher. gr. 8. 84 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 1.20.

Livius (T.) Ed. Ant. Zingerle. Pars VI. Fasc. I. Liber XXXVI-XXXVIII. Ed. maior. 8. vi, 188 S. Prag, *F. Tempsky.* L., *G. Freytag.* à m. 1.20.

—— — Ed. minor. 8. 154 S. Ebd. à m. 1.

Mascke (C. H.) Ueb. die Bedeutungen der Sprachlaute u. die Bildung der Wortbegriffe. gr. 8. 105 S. Göttingen, *Akadem. Buchh.* m. 3.

Maximaltarif (Der) des Diocletian, hrsg. v. Th. Mommsen. [Aus "Corpus inscript. lat.," vol. III, Suppl.] Erläutert v. H. Blümner. gr. 4. xiii, 206 S. B., *G. Reimer.* m. 14.

Meusel (H.) Coniecturae Caesarianae. [Aus "Lexicon Caesarianum."] gr. 8. xvii, 182 S. B., *W. Weber.* m. 4.

—— Lexicon Caesarianum. Fasc. XVIII et XIX. Lex.-8. 2. Bd. xi S. u. Sp. 2065-2430, 13 u. 94 S. Ebd. m. 5. (Vol. II, 2 partes kplt., m. 25.80; 2 voll. kplt., m. 45; 3 Halbfrz.-Einbde. à m. 2.50.)

Michaelis (H.) A New Dictionary of the Portuguese and English Languages. 2 parts. gr. 8. L., *F. A. Brockhaus.* à m. 13.50; geb. à m. 15.—1. Portuguese-English. viii, 731 S. 2. English-Portuguese. 743 S.

Mitteilungen aus den orientalischen Sammlungen der königl. Museen zu Berlin. VII. Hft. Fol. B., *W. Spemann.* m. 26.—VII. Himjarische Inschriften u. Alterthümer. 80 S. m. 7 Taf. m. 26.

Morgenstern (Gust.) Arnamagnäanische Fragmente. gr. 8. vii, 54 S. Kopenhagen. L., *E. Gräfe.* m. 3.

Nestle (Eberh.) Nigri, Böhm u. Pellican. gr. 8. 35 S. u. 39 fksm. S. Tübingen, *J. J. Heckenhauer.* m. 3.

Neumann (Max). Eustathios als kritische Quelle f. den Iliastext. [Aus "Jahrbb. f. class. Philol.," 20. Suppl.-Bd.] gr. 8. S. 143-340. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 5.

Nordenstam (E.) Studia syntactica. I. Syntaxis infinitivi Plotiniana. Diss. gr. 8. 81 S. Upsala, *Akadem. Buchh.* m. 1.75.

Nordin (Rich.) Studien in der Themistoklesfrage. Diss. gr. 8. 118 S. Upsala, *Akadem. Buchh.* m. 2.40.

Oestbye (P.) Die Schrift vom Staat der Athener u. die attische Ephebie. gr. 8. 45 S. Christiania, *J. Dybwad in Komm.* m. 1.

Paul (Herm.) Grundriss der germanischen Philologie. II. Bd. 2. Abtlg. 3. (Schluss-)Lfg. Lex.-8. vi u. S. 257-484. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 5. (II 2, m. 8; geb. in Halbsaffian, m. 10.50; kplt., m. 42; geb., m. 50.)

Pauly's Real-Encyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitg. Hrsg. v. Geo. Wissowa. In 10 Bdn. 1. Halbbd. gr. 8. 1. Bd. Sp. 1-1440. St., *J. B. Metzler's Verl.* m. 15; 1. Lfg. m. 2.

Percy's Reliques of Ancient English Poetry. Hrsg. u. m. Einleitg. u. Registern versehen v. M. M. A. Schröer. 2 Bde. 8. B., *E. Felber.* m. 15; Einbde. à m. 1.—1. Neue Ausg. xxviii, 524 S. m. 4.—2. S. 525-1134. m. 11.

Philostrati maioris imagines, Ottonis Benndorfii et Caroli Schenkelii consilio et opera adiuti recensuerunt seminariorum Vindobonensium sodales. 8. xxxi, 267 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2.80.

Plauti (T. Macci) comoediae. Recensuit Frdr. Ritschelius, sociis operae adsumptis Gust. Loewe, Geo. Goetz, Frdr. Schoell. Tomi IV, fasc. IV. Mostellaria. Ed. II. a Frdr. Schoell recognita. gr. 8. xlvi, 223 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 6. (I–IV, m. 23.20.)

—— Ex recensione Geo. Goetz et Frdr. Schoell. Fasc. I. Amphitruonem, Asinariam, Aululariam complectens. 8. xxxiii, 158 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 1.50.

Polybii historiae. Editionem a Ludw. Dindorfio curatam retractavit Thdr. Büttner-Wobst. Vol. III. 8. xxiv, 430 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* à m. 3.60.

Precatio pro universa ecclesia ex sacra liturgia S. J. Chrysostomi quinquaginta linguis exarata. Curavit P. Grigoris Dr. Kalemkiar, C. Mechith. Ed. II. 4. 107 S. Wien, *Gerold & Co.* m. 5; geb., m. 6.

Pridik (Eug.) De Alexandri Magni epistularum commercio. Diss. gr. 8. 166 S. Jurjew (Dorpat), *E. J. Karow.* m. 3.60.

Rappold (J.) Chrestomathie aus griechischen Classikern. 12. x, 93 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn.* kart., m. 1.40.

Raumer (Sigm. v.) Die Metapher bei Lucrez. gr. 8. vi, 129 S. Erlangen, *Th. Blaesing.* m. 1.50.

Reinisch (Leo). Die Beḍauye-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika. II. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8. 80 S. Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.* m. 1.80.

Reitzenstein (R.) Epigramm u. Skolion. gr. 8. vii, 288 S. Giessen, *J. Ricker.* m. 6.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken deutscher Mundarten, hrsg. v. Otto Bremer. I. u. II. Bd. gr. 8. L., *Breitkopf & Härtel.* à m. 5; geb. à m. 6.50.—I. Deutsche Phonetik v. Otto Bremer. xxiii, 208 S. m. 2 Taf. II. Bibliographie der deutschen Mundartenforschung f. die Zeit vom Beginn des 18. Jahrh. bis zum Ende des J. 1889, zusammengestellt v. Ferd. Mentz. xx, 181 S.

—— indogermanischer Wörterbücher. IV. gr. 8. Strassburg i. E., *K. J. Trübner Verl.*—IV. Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie v. Paul Horn. xxv, 386 S. m. 15.

Schmid (Wilh.) Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius v. Halikarnass bis auf den 2. Philostratus. 3. Bd. 7. Abschn. Aelian. gr. 8. 349 S. St., *W. Kohlhammer.* m. 7.20. (1–3, m. 18.20.)

Schmidt (Otto Ed.) Der Briefwechsel des M. Tullius Cicero von seinem Prokonsulat in Cilicien bis zu Caesars Ermordung. gr. 8. xi, 535 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 12.

Schmidt (Rich.) Das Kathākāutukam des Çrīvara. gr. 8. 46 S. Kiel, *C. F. Haeseler's Verl.* m. 2.

Steinschneider (Mor.) Die hebräischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters. 2 Bde. Lex.-8. xxxiv, 1077 S. B., *Bibliogr. Bureau.* m. 30; geb. Velinpap., m. 40.

Studien in arabischen Dichtern. I. Hft. gr. 8. B., *Mayer & Müller.*— 1. Dr. L. Abel's neue Mu'allaqât-Ausgabe, nachgeprüft v. Geo. Jacob. iv, 80 S. m. 2.80.

Studien, französische. Hrsg. v. G. Körting u. E. Koschwitz. Neue Folge. 1. Hft. gr. 8. B., *W. Gronau.* m. 6.—I. Bibliographie des patois gallo-romans par Dietr. Behrens. 2. éd., revue et augmentée par l'auteur, traduite en français par Eugène Rabiet. viii, 255 S. m. 6.

Sylloge epigraphica orbis romani. Vol. II. Fasc. 3 et 4. L., *Fock.* à m. 1.40.

Syriani in Hermogenem commentaria, edidit Hugo Rabe. Vol. II. Commentarium in librum περὶ στάσεων. Accedunt indices. 8. viii, 222 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2; kplt., m. 3.20.

Thiele (Geo.) Hermagoras. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rhetorik. 8. ix, 202 S. Strassburg, *Trübner.* m. 6.

Tundale. Das mittelengl. Gedicht ueb. die Vision des Tundalus, hrsg. v. Albr. Wagner. 8. xl, 146 S. Halle a. S., *M. Niemeyer.* m. 4.

Urkunden, aegyptische, aus den königl. Museen zu Berlin, hrsg. v. der General-Verwaltg. Griechische Urkunden. 6. Hft. Imp.-4. Bl. 161–192. B., *Weidmann.* à m. 2.40.

Vergilii Maronis (P.) Aeneidos epitome. Scholarum in usum ed. E. Hoffmann. 12. 266 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn.* kart., m. 1.40.

Vietor (W.) Deutsche Lauttafel. gr. 8. 12 S. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 1.50.

—— Englische Lauttafel. gr. 8. 12 S. Ebd. m. 1.50.

—— Französische Lauttafel. gr. 8. 12 S. Ebd. m. 1.50.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulr. v.) De tribus carminibus latinis. Progr. gr. 8. 26 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. —50.

Wilmanns (W.) Deutsche Grammatik. Gotisch, Alt-, Mittel- u. Neuhochdeutsch. 1. Abtlg. Lautlehre. 4 Lfgn. gr. 8. xix, 332 S. Strassburg i. E., *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 6.50.

Xenophon's Hellenika. Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. Rich. Grosser. 1. Bdchn. Buch I u. II. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes.* m. 1.20.

Zanchi (Vincenzo). L'Ecuba e le Trojane di Euripide. gr. 8. xiii, 356 S. Wien, *C. Konegen.* m. 5.

Zimmer (Heinr.) Nennius vindicatus. Ueber Entstehg., Geschichte u. Quellen der Historia Brittonum. gr. 8. viii, 342 S. B., *Weidmann.* m. 12.

ITALIAN.

De Gregorio (G.) Per la storia comparata delle letterature neo-latine. Palermo. 8vo, p. 65. L. 3.50.

Studi italiani di filologia classica. Firenze. 8vo, gr. p. 512. L. 20.

Zanchi (V.) L'Ecuba e le Trojane di Euripide: studio critico-letterario. Spalato. 16mo, p. 356. L. 5.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Alfred the Great, The Legal Code of. Edited with an introduction by M. H. Turk. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893. $1.05.

Arati Phaenomena, recensuit Ernestus Maass. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1893. 5 m.

ΑΘΗΝΑ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικόν. Τόμος πέμπτος. τεῦχος πρῶτον, τ. δεύτερον. ʼΑθήνησιν, 1893.

Belling (H.) Kritische Prolegomena zu Tibull. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1893. 3 m.

Bibliotheca Philologica Classica. 20ter Jahrgang, 1893. Erstes Quartal. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1893.

Botsford (George Willis). The Athenian Constitution. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. IV.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893.

Bremer (Otto). Deutsche Phonetik. (Grammatiken deutscher Mundarten, Band I.) Leipzig, *Breitkopf u. Härtel*, 1893.

Carus (Paul). The Religion of Science. Chicago, *Open Court Publ. Co.*, 1893. 25 cts.

Catullus. Ed. by E. M. Merrill. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893. $1.50.

Collar (W. C.) and Daniell (M. G.) The Beginner's Greek Composition. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893.

Dionis Prusaei quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia edidit, apparatu critico instruxit J. de Arnim. Vol. I. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1893. 14 m.

Dyer (F. W.) The Lingualumina, or Language of Light. Part II. The Geronyms. London, *Waterlow & Sons*, 1893. 1s.

Educational Review. Ed. by N. M. Butler. New York, *H. Holt & Co.*, 1893. $3 per annum.

Egypt Exploration Fund. Archaeological Report, 1892–93. Ed. by F. D. Griffith. With seven illustrations and map. London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.*, 1893.

Errors in School-books. Boston, *Albert A. Pope*, 1893.

Fourière (L'Abbé). Revue d'exegèse mythologique (semi-mensuelle). Amiens, 1893.

Fries (Carolus). Quaestiones Herodoteae. Berlin, *Richard Heinrich*, 1893.

de Fritze (Johannes). De libatione veterum graecorum. Berlin, *Richard Heinrich*, 1893.

von Gebhardt (Oscar). Das Evangelium und die Apokalypse des Petrus. Die neuentdeckten Bruchstücke nach einer Photographie der Handschrift zu Gizeh in Lichtdruck herausgegeben. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung*, 1893.

Gomperz (Theodor). Aus der Hekale des Kallimachos. Neue Bruchstücke anlässlich der XLII. Versammlung deutscher Philologen u. Schulmänner in Wien. Herausg. von T. G. Mit 2 Tafeln. Wien, 1893.

Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, unter Mitwirkung von zahlreichen Gelehrten herausg. von Hermann Paul. II. Band. 2. Abteilung. 3. Lieferung. Schluss des ganzen Werkes. Strassburg, *Karl J. Trübner*, 1893. 4 m.

Grundriss der romanischen Philologie, unter Mitwirkung von zahlreichen Gelehrten herausg. von Gustav Gröber. II. Band. 1. Abteilung. 1. Lieferung; 2. Abt. 1. Lieferung. Strassburg, *Karl J. Trübner*, 1893. @ 2 m. 80 pf.

Hanssen (Federico). Sobre la interpretacion de un pasage de la Iliada (de Iovis consilio). Publicado en los Anales de la Universidad Santiago de Chile. *Imprento Cervantes*, 1893.

Herodotos. Erklärt von Heinrich Stein. Zweiter Band. 1. Heft. Buch III. 4te verb. Aufl. Fünfter Band. Buch VIII u. IX. 5te verb. Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1893. 1 m. 50 pf. u. 2 m. 25 pf.

Johnson (Franciscus). De coniunctivi et optativi usu Euripideo in enuntiatis finalibus et condicionalibus. (Diss.) Berlin, *R. Heinrich*, 1893.

Jurenka (Hugo). Novae lectiones Pindaricae. (Sep. Abdr. aus Wiener Studien, Bd. IX.) Wien, *K. Gerold's Sohn*, 1893.

Keelhoff (J.) La culture formelle et la culture réelle. Liège, *Gunsé*, 1893.

Lawton (William Cranston). Womanhood in the Iliad. Reprinted from *Atlantic Monthly* for June, 1893.

Lucas (Johannes). Studia Theognidea. Berlin, *R. Heinrich*, 1893.

Lucianus. Recogn. Iulius Sommerbrodt. Vol. Sec. Pars Prior. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1893. 6 m.

Macdonald (Arthur). Abnormal man, being essays on education and crime and related subjects. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1893.

Mather (F. Jewett). The Conditional Sentence in Anglo-Saxon. (J. H. U. Diss.) Munich, 1893.

Monuments grecs, publiés par l'Association pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France. Nos. 19-20, 1891-92. Deuxième volume. Miroirs grecs à pied par M. Étienne Michon. Note sur une statue d'Apollon par M. Maurice Holleaux. Paris, *Maissonneuve et Cie.*, 1893.

Morgan (M. H.) A Bibliography of Persius. Bibliographical Contributions, ed. by Justin Winsor. No. 49. Cambridge, Mass., *Library of Harvard Univ.*, 1893.

Müller (F. Max). Three Introductory Lectures on the Science of Thought. Chicago, *Open Court Publishing Co.*, 1893. 75 cts.

Murray (James A. H.) A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Part VII. Consignificant–Crouching. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. $3.25.

Nencini (Flaminius). Quaestiones Terentianae alterae. (Reprints from *Rivista di Filologia*.) Turin, *Loescher*, 1893.

Nordenstam (E.) Studia syntactica. I. Syntaxis infinitivi Plotiniani. Upsala, 1893.

Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi. Tredie Række. Første Binds fferde Hæfte. København, 1893.

Papadimitracopoulos (Th.) Nouveaux documents épigraphiques démontrant l'antiquité de la prononciation des grecs modernes. Extrait de ΕΛΛΑΣ, 1890.

—— Le poète Aristophane et les partisans d'Erasme. Extrait de ΕΛΛΑΣ IV. Leide, *E. J. Brill*, 1892.

Persii, Iuvenalis, Sulpiciae Saturae recogn. Otto Iahn. Ed. tertia.

Curam egit Franciscus Buecheler. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1893. 3 m.

Philostrati Maioris Imagines. Ottonis Benndorfii et Caroli Schenkelii consilio et opera adiuti recensuerunt seminariorum Vindobonensium sodales. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1893.

Pindar. The Olympian and Pythian Odes, with notes explanatory and critical, introductions and introductory essays. By C. A. M. Fennell, Litt. D. Cambridge, *At the University Press.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893.

Plutarchi Pythici. Dialogi Tres. Recensuit Guilhelmus R. Paton. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1893. 5 m.

Ross (C. H.) The Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English. (Publications of the Modern Language Association of America. Ed. by James W. Bright. New Series. Vol. I, No. 3.) Baltimore, *The Association*, 1893.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialektinschriften. Herausg. von H. Collitz. Zweiter Band. IV. Heft. Die delphischen Inschriften. 2. Teil. Bearbeitet von Johannes Baunack. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*, 1892. 3 m. 20 pf.

Schmid (W.) Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern dargestellt. Dritter Band. Siebenter Abschnitt. Aelian. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*, 1893.

Sepp (Simon). Die philosophische Richtung des Cornelius Celsus. Diss. Erlangensis. Freising, *Fellerer*, 1893.

Sophocles. The Philoctetes of. Ed. by Frank Pierrepoint Graves. Boston, *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1893.

v. Sybel (Heinrich). Die Erhebung Europas gegen Napoleon I. Drei Vorlesungen. Ed. with notes by A. B. Nichols. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893. 66 cts.

Symbolae Pragenses. Festgabe der deutschen Gesellschaft für Alterthumskunde in Prag zur 42. Versammlung deutscher Philologen u. Schulmänner in Wien, 1893. Mit 2 Tafeln. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1893.

Terence. The Adelphoe of. With introduction, notes and critical appendix by Sidney G. Ashmore. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893.

Thomas (Cyrus). Are the Maya Hieroglyphs phonetic? Reprint from *American Anthropological Journal* for July, 1893.

Twelfth Annual Report of the Dante Society. Cambridge, Mass., May 16, 1893. Cambridge, *John Wilson & Son*, 1893.

Van Daell (Alphonse N.) An Introduction to the French Language, being a practical grammar with exercises. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893. $1.10.

Velleius Paterculus. Book II, Chapters XLI–CXXXI. Ed. with introduction and notes by Frank Ernest Rockwood. Boston, *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1893.

Vergil's Aeneid. The Seventh Book. Ed. for the use of schools by W. C. Collar. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893. 50 cts.

Zimmer (Heinrich). Nennius Vindicatus. Ueber Entstehung, Geschichte u. Quellen der.*Historia Brittonum.* Von Heinrich Zimmer. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1893. 12 m.